

England Church 858. e 22
2

A
VINDICATION
OF THE
Church of *England*
FROM THE
ASPERSIONS
Of a late LIBEL Intituled,
Priestcraft in Perfection, &c.

WHEREIN

The controverted Clause of the Church's Power
in the XXth Article is shewn to be of equal
Authority with all the rest of the Articles;
and the Fraud and Forgery, charged upon the
Clergy on the Account of that Clause, are
retorted upon their Accusers.

With a Preface containing some Remarks upon the *Reflections*
on that Pamphlet.

By a Priest of the Church of *England*.

To leave out of an Article is as great a Crime as to put in;
and a main rasure is as censurable — as a Forgery.
Arch-bishop Laud's Speech in the Star-Chamber, Remains
Vol. 2. p. 83.

The Haters of the Lord have been found Liars, Psalm. 83. 16.

A little Philosophy inclines Men's Mind to Atheism; but
depth in Philosophy brings Men's Minds about to Re-
ligion. *Lord Bacon's Essays*, p. 90.

London: Printed by W. B. for R. Wilkin, at the King's-Head
in St. Paul's-Church-yard. 1710.

W. B.

VINDICATION

OF THE

Church of England

A STEP BY STEP

Investigation in the Church

W. H. R. 1841

The following is a list of the names of the

in the XXth century, and of the names of the

and the names of the persons who have been

Clery on the subject of the Church, and

in the Church, and of the names of the

in the Church, and of the names of the

in the Church, and of the names of the

in the Church, and of the names of the

in the Church, and of the names of the

in the Church, and of the names of the

in the Church, and of the names of the

THE PREFACE.

IT may be wonder'd at, that I shou'd call this Answer to *Priestcraft in Perfection, A Vindication of the Church of England*, when the Author of that Pamphlet does not only upon every occasion, in the name of himself and his Friends, stile the Church of *England, our Church*, but gives her the Title ^a of a *most excellent and pure Church*, and writes this Treatise on purpose to ^b *render her the best constituted Church in the whole World*. But they that knew the Character of this Author, and you need go no farther for it, than to the Paper I am answering, will think it equally an Aspersion upon a Church, so truly excellent and pure, as the Church of *England* is, (without either the Complement or the Help of this Gentleman) for such as he and his Friends to call her *ours*, and for her to

^a *Priestcraft* p. 9.

^b *Ibid.* p. 11.

The Preface

want their Assistance to mend her Constitution. Yet that is not all the Aspersions cast upon her by this great Friend to her and her Clergy; for to shew us, that he dare do, what he ^c questions whether any one besides *among the Laity dare at this day* (I suppose he means, now there is so little liberty for free-thinking) that he dare even *expose himself to the imputation of Atheism, by meddling with such sacred things*; he charges her whole Ministry with *Priestcraft in Perfection*, and arraigns her *Authority in Controversies of Faith*, not only as *absurd* and a *Popish Usurpation*, but as procur'd by the *Fraud and Forgery* of her *Priests*; and 'tis to *wipe off the Scandal* of this Authority, that in great tenderness to her, he has favour'd the World with this *Detection of the Fraud*; and to ^a *acquit himself like a Protestant, in throwing out a Clause*, that all the *Priests* in our Church have been so much *Papists* to *subscribe* for above 100 Years, even in his Account. He tells ^e us of another such *noble Service*, that he thought the *Legislature* were doing her some time since, that of *clearing her* from another Absurdity, tho' by good luck it is no *Popery*, *from maintaining the most absurd*

^c *Priestcraft*. p. 23, 24. ^d *Priestcraft* p. 45. ^e *Ibid.* p. 9.
and

The Preface.

iii

and blasphemous Doctrine of Passive-Obedience: And since he happens to be so much out in his Politicks, and 'tis pity the Church should lie under the load of any scandal, that her Friends can wipe off from her; in order to the effecting also of this other noble Service to her, I would recommend him to the Assistance of the same kind hand, from ^f whose discoveries of old MSS he had the first hint of the Forgery above-mention'd; if that Author ^s out of his vast reading is able to give us an History of Impositions, as big as the History of the Reformation; it may be he may help him also to a detection of the Fraud of inserting and continuing this blasphemous Doctrine in all the publick Monuments of our Church, and in the Holy Scriptures themselves; at least he may enable him to shew the absurdity of it, out of his own Writings. In the mean time a Church, that lies under the scandal of maintaining a Doctrine, that is *absurd and blasphemous*, and of assuming an Authority, that is also *absurd*, and if not *blasphemous*, yet is *Popish* (by which I suppose is meant something worse) cannot but stand in need of a Vindication; which is what I undertake in this Answer, and therefore

^f *Priestcraft* p. 18.

^s *Ibid* p. 23.

give it that Title, tho' at present I propose to defend her only against one of these Absurdities, and the pretended Forgery charg'd upon her; because her *Accuser* has yet attempted to make only that part of his Charge good: When he shall find leisure to undertake the other, I shall be ready to vindicate her as to that too; and shew, that she is as clear from all *blasphemy* in her Doctrine, as from Forgery in her Articles; and as in this present Vindication I shall endeavour to retort his Charge of Fraud and Forgery upon himself and his Party: So in that other I do not question but to fasten those unmannerly Epithets upon the Author of them, and shew him, that it is not the *Doctrine of Passive-Obedience*, but only what he and his Party have ever yet been able to alledge against it, that is *absurd*; and that all that is *blasphemous* in this Matter, is his Impiety in bringing so heavy a charge against a Doctrine, that has a most manifest Foundation in the word of God, and has been own'd and practis'd as such, not only by the Church of *England*, but by the whole Christian Church, in all Ages down to this day, notwithstanding all the Attempts of the *Gates of Hell*, which we trust shall never be able to prevail against it.

The Preface.

But one ¹ that seems to be no Enemy to our Author, has found that his acuteness is not equal to his zeal; and to carry on the matter (against the Articles of our Church,) further than he had done, who one would think had carried it far enough, observes, that this Gentleman might have spar'd all the pains he has taken to prove, that the Clause of the Church's Power was not contain'd in the imprinted Book of Articles, that was establish'd by Law; for that as he undertakes to shew from the Law it self, and from undeniable Authority, none of the Articles contain'd in that imprinted Book, were confirm'd by Law, except those Articles, which only concern the Confession of the true Christian Faith, and the Doctrine of the Sacraments. He wonders ¹ that a Gentleman so willing to destroy the Credit of Church Authority, should overlook this Consideration, which in his Opinion overthrows the Legal Establishment, not only of that single Clause, but of that and several other intire Articles; and I suppose to shew himself as willing as that Gentleman, to destroy the Authority both of the Church, and of her Articles, he has thought fit to

¹ Reflections on a late Pamphlet, intitled, Priestcraft in Perfection. ¹ Ibid. p. 2.

The Preface.

makethis new discovery. But he himself with all his *acuteness* does not consider, that it was this Gentleman's business to prove the Forgery of the contested Clause, rather than its want of legal Authority, and this latter only in order to the former; and therefore tho' we have no reason to question, but he wou'd be as willing as this *Reflector*, or any Man living, to destroy the Authority of all the Articles of our Church, and even of our Creed, as he gives but too plain intimation; yet it was more to his present purpose, to prove the Forgery of one Clause, than the above-mention'd deficiency in all the Articles. However I am inclin'd to think with the Writer of these *Reflections*, that whatever our Author's *acuteness* is, his *zeal* against the Church is so great, that he would not have omitted any Argument he could find, in disproof of the Authority of her Articles, whether it had been directly to his present purpose or not; nor have left to another the honour of a discovery, which he had been able to make himself, and thought might any ways conduce to his main purpose of undermining all Religion. But how does the *Reflector* make good this discovery? He

ob-

The Preface.

vii

observes ^k, that the Articles referr'd to in the Act ^l of Parliament, are *All the Articles of Religion, which only concern the Confession of the true Christian Faith, and the Doctrine of the Sacraments*, as the Act it self expresses them; and that by this Expression are excluded ^m all other Articles, which fall not under those two Heads, viz. *Articles of Discipline, &c*; that Mr. Selden does not only thus interpret ⁿ the Law, but alledges in defence of that Interpretation, that the Articles were subscrib'd in that sense, till Arch-bishop Bancroft's time; and that it appears ^o from a Speech made in the Parliament of 1575, that the preceding Parliament, when they injoin'd Subscription to the Articles, did first put out several of them. This is the Sum of what he alledges to prove, that the Parliament of 1571 did not confirm all the 39 Articles, but only such of them, as contain matter of Faith, and the Doctrine of the Sacraments. And to this I answer,

1st, As the Articles pass'd by the Convocation of 1562, and ratify'd by the Queen, had all the Authority necessary to make them obligatory, and were subscrib'd to by virtue of that Au-

^k Ibid. ^l Act. 13. Eliz. c. 12. ^m Resol. p. 3. ⁿ Table Talk p. 3, 4. ^o Resol. p. 4, 5.

thority only, for above 9 Years, till the
 Parliament of 1571 injoin'd Subscription
 on to them under a Penalty; as they
 had no other Authority, when they were
 review'd and again subscrib'd by the Con-
 vocation of 1571; and were to be sub-
 scrib'd to even by that Act of Parlia-
 ment, as Articles pass'd in Convocation,
 and confirm'd by the Queen, without
 the least mention of any farther Autho-
 rity added, or intended to be added to
 them by the Parliament, or any farther
 Confirmation of them, neither thought
 necessary, or design'd them by that Act,
 more than with regard to those, who
 were *subject for wrath*, more than for
Conscience-sake, to enforce that Subscrip-
 tion by a Penalty, which would not
 (tho' it should) have been made without
 it: As this was all the Confirmation
 by Act of Parliament, which the Articles
 of our Religion ever had: So with re-
 gard to the obligation they lay upon
 Conscience, it had not been the least
 prejudice to their Authority, if they
 had never had this: Nay in some sense
 they may be said to have had even a le-
 gal Authority without it, inasmuch
 as they had (as I now said) even with-
 out this pretended Confirmation, all
 the Authority requisite to make them
 obligatory by the direction of an
 Act

The Preface.

ix

Act of Parliament in this behalf. So that if this Gentleman were able to prove, not only of some, but of all the Articles, that they were not confirm'd by Parliament, they would remain of unquestionable Authority for all that. But, really, it is not so plain as this Author imagines, that any of them were either intended to be excepted, or actually excepted by that Act, which enjoins Subscription to the Articles. It is true the Act mentions them under the Title of Articles which only concern the confession of the true Christian Faith, and the Doctrine of the Sacraments; but since it calls them all the Articles of Religion (not all those Articles) which only concern, &c. and adds that they are compriz'd in a Book imprinted, intituled, Articles whereupon it was agreed by the Arch-bishops and Bishops of both Provinces, and the whole Clergy in the Convocation holden at London in the Year of our Lord 1562 according to the computation of the Church of England, for the avoiding of the diversity of Opinions, and for the establishing of Consent touching true Religion, put forth by the Queen's Authority; which being the whole Title of

The Preface.

the Book, also takes in all the Articles; and there is no farther exception of any of them, than what is thought to be implied in that Expression, *which only concern*, &c: why may we not take the words, (*true Christian Faith*) in the Parliament's Account of the Articles, to mean the same thing with *true Religion* in the Title of the Book, and equally to refer to all the Articles? As if it had been express'd thus, that the Persons therein mention'd *shall subscribe to all the Articles of Religion, which* (or all which) Articles, *only concern the Confession of the true Christian Faith*, &c; as in the Title of the Book they are all said to have been *agreed upon for establishing of consent touching true Religion*. I do not deny, that the words are not only capable of the other construction, but that that may seem rather the more obvious sense of them; and it is not improbable, that the Bill was so worded by that Party, who would have had some of the Articles excluded by the Act; and that those Articles were actually *put out of the Book*, brought in with that Bill; which was probably what the Archbishop meant by asking the Question, from which this Author would argue, that they were actually excluded; *viz.* why the *Articles of the Homilies, &c. were*
put

The Preface.

xi

put out of that Book; of which more by and by: but as obvious as that sense is, and as much as it might be the real sense of one Party, it does not appear, that the Parliament had any such meaning, when they pass'd the Act: For if that Sense of the Words had actually pass'd, and the Parliament had by this Act intended to injoin Subscription only to some of the Articles, they would not have contented themselves with such a general Description, either of those that were to be subscrib'd, or of those they design'd to exclude by this Act, as that it should not be certainly known by it, which were to be subscrib'd, and which not: But would have expressly nam'd at least all those they had intended to exclude, if that had been the less number of the two: And the Arch-bishop's Question now mention'd, from which the *Reflector* wou'd infer such an exclusion, seems to suppose the Articles excluded, to have been nam'd, viz. those for the Homilies, &c. Indeed without such an expresse and particular determination of that general Exclusion, the sense of the Act had been left uncertain, and consequently the due observance of it impossible, unless a Law could be observed, without being understood: And the Author of these *Reflections* does in

a great measure owns this. How many, says he? of our 39 Articles are struck out by the foregoing Comments on the Law, cannot be known with that certainty, as if we had the Imprinted Book of the Articles recorded, as our other Laws are, then perhaps, adds he, we should have seen, what Articles were confirm'd, and what were not confirm'd. Whether he means by this, that the Imprinted Book of Articles was never recorded (as there is no notice of any such thing in the Act; at least of it's having been tack'd to the Original Act, which the Author of *Priestcraft* seems to understand by its being recorded) or whether with that Author he would insinuate, that it had been purloin'd from the Act: He plainly supposes the sense of the Act uncertain, for want of that necessary Key to it: And yet, I do not see, how even that Book could determine this uncertainty, unless the Articles, to which the Act did not injoin Subscription, were actually struck out of it; which must have been mention'd in the Act, if there had been any such thing, as thence we may conclude, there was not, because the Act does not mention it. But whatever it is that renders the sense of the Act uncer-

tain, according to this Author's Interpretation of it, or whatever be wanting to determine that uncertainty; it is plain those words (*which only concern the Confession of the true Christian Faith, &c*) alleg'd as excluding several Articles out of this Act, do not even in his Opinion so effectually exclude any, as that you can know certainly which they are, that are excluded by them; unless therefore we can imagine, that the Parliament, when they enjoin'd Subscription to the Articles, tho' they did not design all of them should be subscrib'd, yet would leave it uncertain, which were to be subscrib'd and which not, and oblige Men to the performance of what they could not understand (which supposes them either unwilling or unable to explain themselves) we must conclude from this uncertainty at least, that it is also uncertain, that they design'd any Exception, or rather that because they did not expressly except any of the Articles out of that Obligation to Subscription, they therefore intended to include them all under it; and might think that sufficiently signify'd by refusing the Bill with a Book annex'd to it, in which some of the Articles were put out, (as that Bill was probably brought in by the Party) without altering that Expression in the Bill; which tho' not im-

improbably suited to the same purpose, yet as it was capable of a different sense from theirs, who seem to have been the framers of it; so it was not sufficiently expressive of their sense, unless the Articles intended to be excluded by it, had been otherwise more particularly and expressly excepted; so that we may proceed farther, and assert, that as it is at least far from being plain, that the Parliament intended any such exclusion, as this Author contends for, and still more, what that Exclusion was: So,

3dly, Unless it were plain, both that some of the Articles were intended to be excluded from the Subscription injoin'd by this Act, and also which these Articles are, the Act must be concluded to enjoin Subscription to them all: For tho' we could imagine a Parliament capable of intending an Exception without sufficiently expressing it, and of enjoining Subscription to the Articles with a reserve, and yet leaving it uncertain, what Articles were not within that Law, such an Act even contrary to the intention of it would include what it design'd to except, and the Articles intended to be excluded by it would be as obligatory, as any of the rest, even by vertue of this Act, that should have excluded them, supposing they could
not

not be certainly known; because upon that Supposition, no Man could be sure of fulfilling the Act, without subscribing every one of the Articles. And as the Act may thus consequentially, tho' it did not intentionally make Subscription necessary to all the Articles, for want of sufficiently declaring, which it intended to except; so it may likewise, for want of sufficiently declaring, that it intended to except any; I mean upon this Gentleman's Supposition, that such was the Intention of this Act; whereas we have seen, that the words do not necessarily imply, that the intent of the Act was, that any of the Articles should be exempted from the obligation of Subscription requir'd by it, much less does the Act ascertain, which of them shall be thus exempted; and if Subscription to all the Articles be made necessary by the Act, whether by the intention of the Parliament, of which I think there is no doubt; or contrary to it, which is the Complement made them by these *Reflections*, it is all one to me; what the Act makes so necessary, that without the Performance of it, no Man can be certain to fulfil the Act, that it certainly enjoins to be perform'd; and consequently the Act of the 13th of Queen *Elizabeth* does even by this

this Gentleman's Concession enjoin Subscription to all the Articles.

And this will appear farther if we consider, that by vertue of this Act, as the Articles were to be subscrib'd by the Clergy, so they were to be also publickly read by them in their Parish Churches, and their unfeign'd Assent declared to them, and no Doctrine directly contrary to any of them maintain'd and persisted in, and all this under the penalty of Deprivation. Now tho' the Parliament should be suppos'd to have meant all this only of some Articles, without sufficiently distinguishing which; who would have incurr'd such a Penalty by venturing to leave any one Article out of his Subscription or Declaration of Assent, or to maintain a Doctrine contrary to any one of the 39, since it is so uncertain as our Author owns, which of them was excepted by this Act? Nay who would have risked the Loss of his Benefice upon such an uncertainty, as that the Parliament did hereby intend to except any of them? So that at worst their intent, upon such an impossible Supposition, would have had no effect, for want of being more fully explain'd; and

unless we could have any grounds to believe, that they were not able to explain themselves, their not doing it is a clear Argument, they had no such design; and therefore we may conclude, that whether these words (*which only concern the Confession of the true Christian Faith, and the Doctrine of the Sacraments*) were first put in by that Party, who aim'd at such an Exclusion of some of the Articles; and afterwards neglected by the other, as capable also of taking in the whole; or the Parliament chose by them, in the way of a Parenthesis, to express their general Sense of *all the Articles of Religion, compriz'd in a Book, Intituled, &c.* as the Clause would run without this Parenthesis; and that not improbably in opposition to the Canons of the Convocation then sitting, which are also styl'd *Articles* in the Title; for which of these, or for whatever other reason the Act was so worded, the Parliament certainly intended, that all the Articles should be subscrib'd; that the Clergy should declare their unfeign'd Assent to them all; and that they should not maintain any Doctrine repugnant to the least Clause of any of the 39, under the penalty of Deprivation.

And

And did not the Convocation which sat at the same time, and review'd and ratify'd these Articles, oblige the Clergy to subscribe them, as themselves had done, without any such Exception as is pretended, and that under pain of excommunication? Which at once shews the falshood of what this Gentleman quotes from Mr. Selden, That Arch-bishop Bancroft began it, that Ministers should subscribe to the 39 Articles; and renders it highly improbable, that the Parliament intended to except any Articles out of the Subscription they injoin'd to them? For is it at all likely, either that the Canons shou'd require more than the Law wou'd allow, or that the Law should mean less, than the Canons requir'd, when the Parliament and the Convocation, that made them both, sat at the same time, and acted as it were in concert together? As the Convocation would hardly have attempted to go contrary to the Parliament in any thing; so if the Parliament had intended the Subscription enjoin'd by their Act should be less extensive, than that requir'd by the Canons, which were making at the same time, it was because they look'd upon that unlimited

^r Lib. Quorund. Canon. A^o. 1571. Can. 1. & 6.

Subscription to be too rigid, and in this Act chose to abate the rigour of it; and is it imaginable in that Case, that they would have done this without making the least complaint of it? However when the Bishops afterwards oblig'd the Clergy to subscribe to all the Articles, (as they did in pursuance of these Canons, and I shall give some Instances of such Subscriptions presently) this being supposed contrary to the Intentions and Directions of the Act of Parliament, would most certainly have been loudly complain'd of by the Party, who had procur'd this pretended mitigation; and yet we find no such Complaint during that long Reign. In the Years 1571 and 1572, says Mr. Rogers², when Subscription first was requir'd, the whole Land will witness, that many and sundry Books (as well in Latin as English) then and afterwards flew abroad. He proceeds to tell us in their own Words, how much those factious Writers magnify'd their pretended new Discoveries, above the Doctrines that had been taught by the first Reformers, and since confirmed by all the Authority in the Nation, both Ecclesiastick and Civil; and concludes with these Words of

² Pref. to his Expos. on the Artic. p. 12.

The Preface.

some of those Writers; *The Articles of Religion* penned and agreed upon by the Bishops and Clergy, and ratify'd by the Prince and Parliament, in comparison of these Things now reveal'd and newly come to light, are but *Childish and Toyes*; so that they however, among all their new Discoveries, had not yet found out, that they were only some of these Articles, which the Parliament had ratify'd. The next Subscription was required by Arch-bishop *Whitgift* in 1584, and that (says the same Author ^u) both unto the *Points of Religion in the Convocation A^o. 1662* approv'd, and likewise unto other Articles necessary for Concord Sake, of all and every Man, Ministers especially, to be acknowledg'd; and accordingly by due Course of Law called then thereunto. This of the Brethren says he, was term'd *The woeful Tear of Subscription*, and now again, and divers Tears ensuing, their Treatises flew about like Atoms; and yet (as he proceeds ^w to give an Account of them) they were chiefly directed against the Government and Discipline of the Church; a plain Argument that those Points were not then understood to be excepted out of the Subscription required by Act of Parliament: If they had,

^u Ibid. §. 11. ^w Ibid. §. 15.

The Preface.

373

one would think those Writers should rather have let alone these points, which the Parliament had freed them from the trouble of considering; and turn'd their Pens against that pretended *due course of Law*, by which they were called to subscribe what they were thus exempted from by Act of Parliament. But I do not meet with the least Word of any such complaint. On the contrary, at the end of this very *woeful Year of Subscription*, in the Parliament of 1584 and 1585, tho' there was a strong party that design'd to relax the discipline of the Church, and several Complaints made of the Bishops rigorously injoining Oaths and Subscriptions, yet there is not the least tittle of this, which must have made a principal Head in those Complaints, and such as could neither have been excus'd nor answered, if they could have grounded it on an Act of Parliament. Nay, tho' the Commons of that Parliament in 16 Articles of Petitions * sent up to the Lords, praying for several Regulations in Church Discipline, and some with respect to this very Act, do among other things desire, *that no — Subscription be tendered to the Clergy, but such as be*

* Sir Sim. D'Ewes Journ. p. 357. &c.

The Preface.

expressly prescrib'd by the Statutes of this Realm, and that several godly and learned Preachers, suspended or depriv'd — only for refusal to subscribe to such Articles, as lately had been tender'd in divers parts of this Realm — may be restor'd — or at least set at liberty to preach, &c. (which was so fair an Opportunity of pleading the pretended exemption of this Statute, that it is hardly conceivable they would have omitted it, had there been any such thing) yet as they make not the least offer at such a Plea; so all the answer they obtain'd to those two Articles of their Petitions was, that for Subscription he (the Arch-bishop of York in the name of the Lords) doubted not, but that it was lawful, and that it might prove the Cause of much order and quietness in the Church; that deprivation was often necessarily us'd in terrorem; and that the party so depriv'd might upon his Submission (as in the case of Excommunication) be receiv'd into favour. Two Years after this Dean Bridges, who had been a Member of the Convocation of 1571, and could not but know in what sense the Parliament of the same Year injoin'd Subscription to the Articles, publish'd his

^v Ibid. p. 360.

The Preface.

xxiii

Defence of the Government establish'd in the Church of England for Ecclesiastical Matters, &c. In this Defence² he says expressly, that the Book of Articles agreed upon by all the Clergy of the Church of England, was approv'd in the High Court of Parliament by all the States of the Realm, and by the Statute (he is speaking of that of the 13th of the Queen) commanded to be read: And the Learned Discourse of Ecclesiastical Government, which he there answers, does also both suppose and assert this, at the same time, that it complains, that the design of the Act was not duly observ'd: But our Brethren, says the Dean³, to mitigate the matter, say, the Parliament had a Godly meaning in making that Statute, for Priests (that had been made in the time of Popery) to profess their consent to the true Doctrine, agreed upon in the Book of Articles, by their publick reading of the same Book in their Benefices. It was agreed then at that time by both Parties, that the true Doctrine was contain'd in all the Articles, and that the Parliament required the Clergy to profess their consent to it, by their publick reading, not of such of them, as in this Author's Sense, do only concern

² Def. Lib. 15. p. 1277.

³ Ibid.

the confession of the true Christian Faith, &c. but of the whole *Book of Articles*: Of such as the Author of these *Reflections* excepts out of the Act, as well as of those he allows to be within the meaning of it: And accordingly the Dean having prov'd, that the Bishops had not violated the meaning of the Act, proceeds to shew, that those who accus'd them of so doing, had actually violated it themselves, and hazarded the loss of their Livings by it, and that by impugning several of the Articles, and charging them of *gross and palpable Errors*; he instances^b particularly in the 34th, 35th, and 36th Articles, all of them suppos'd in these *Reflections* to be excepted by this Act, and two of them pretended to be excepted by name; Dean *Bridges* therefore knew of no Exception of *Articles of Discipline* intended by the Parliament, when they injoin'd Subscription to the Articles, but understood their Act in the same unlimited sense, that he and the rest of the Convocation that Year had pass'd the Canons, which related to the same Subject; nor did the words (*which only concern the confession of the true Christian Faith, &c.*) make any other Impression upon him, than those in the Title of the Book of Articles, which

^b Ibid. p. 1285.

The Preface.

XXV

follows them, tho' he could not but consider them, when he took the pains to transcribe ^c all that part of the Act; and I know not why he may not be thought as good a Judge, either as Mr. *Selden*, or the Author of these Reflections, of the meaning of an Act particularly concerning the Clergy, made in his own time, and when he was Member of a Convocation, that was then framing Canons to the same purpose with this Act, and most probably in concert with the Parliament; however to Mr. *Selden's* Opinion I may oppose that of at least as great a Lawyer as he, my Lord Chief Justice *Coke*, who says ^d expressly, that this Act *confirm'd and establish'd the 39 Articles of Religion*; to which I may add that of all the Judges, who evidently suppose this in their Resolution ^e of the Case of subscribing the Articles with a Declaration.

But Mr. *Selden* does not only give us his Opinion in this Matter, but confirms that Opinion by a Fact, which the *Reflector* is willing to take upon Mr. *Selden's* great Integrity; and the Fact is, that *the first Subscriptions were only made to those Articles, which contain matter of Faith, and the Doctrine of the*

^c Ibid. p. 1279. ^d Instit. P. 4. c. 74. cit. No Necess. of Reform. Biblioth. Script. Eccl. Angl. p. 360. ^e Bishop Pearson's Answer to Burges, Ibid. p. 373.

Sacraments. I am as ready to appeal to those Subscriptions, as this Gentleman, but have not so much Reason to search the Registers for them as he, whose Cause intirely depends upon the truth of that Fact. However I have now by me four several Subscriptions to the Articles, made by vertue of this Act in the Years 1582, 1584, and 1590, upon two printed Copies of the Articles of the Years 1581, and 1586 (both with the contested Clause in them, to observe that by the way) which Subscriptions plainly include all the Articles, two of them in this form, *Ego his Articulis libenter subscripsi*, the third more fully thus, *Ego --- subscribo absolutè his Articulis &c. contentis iisdem*, and the last most of all in these words, *Ego --- hisce articulis, omnibusq; & singulis contentis in eisdem absolutè subscribo*. Since therefore our Author appeals to those Subscriptions for the truth of what Mr. Selden affirms, he must own, that the Fact is quite otherwise, than that Author represents it; for to use his own Argument, *if the first Subscriptions were made to all the Articles without exception, it must be because the Law was at first understood to relate to all the 39.* But besides his Argument from the first Subscriptions, which these few instances are enough to overthrow, till more and earlier can be produc'd to the con-

contrary, of which there is no great danger; does not Mr. Selden also support that Fact with another, which has been observ'd to be manifestly false, at least in the sense it must be here understood? For however true it be, that *Arch-bishop Bancroft began it, that Ministers should subscribe to three things, to the King's Supremacy, to the Common-Prayer, and to the 39 Articles*, that is no farther a proof, that the Subscriptions to the Articles before that time were not to them all; then as it implies, that he first enjoyn'd, that they should subscribe to all the Articles, and this we have seen is directly false; for that Subscription to all the Articles was enjoyn'd by two several Canons of the Convocation of 1571, above 30 Years before that, in which *Arch-bishop Bancroft* presided. It was enjoyn'd again to them all by the Convocation of 1575, in the first of the *Articles* therein agreed upon touching the admission of apt and fit Persons to the Ministry, and the establishing of good Orders in the Church: And it is very observable, that the Articles there enjoyn'd to be subscrib'd, are express'd in the very same Words with those, to which the Act of Parliament enjoins Subscription, except that the word *only*

on which Mr. Selden and the Author of these *Reflections* lay so much stress, is left out by the Convocation, probably because they found some such ill use made of it; for they express themselves thus, — *Articles of Religion, which concern the confession of the true Christian Faith, and the Doctrine of the Sacraments, compris'd in a Book imprinted, Intituled, Articles, &c.* as appears from an Edition of those *Articles touching the Admission, &c.* printed by Richard Fugge, which I have by me, and take to be the first Impression of them, tho' it be without date. Now as this evidently shews the falshood of what Mr. Selden asserts in defence of his Interpretation of the Act for subscribing the Articles, that it was Arch-bishop *Baneroft* who first oblig'd the Clergy to subscribe them all: So it is a plain proof, that those two Convocations interpreted that Act quite otherwise. I have observ'd how unlikely it was, that the former of them, which sat when the Act was making, should frame Canons contrary to it; and this would have been yet more unwarrantable in the Convocation of 1575, when the Act had been now pass'd four Years; and to have done it in the manner they did, by using the words of the Act, and only leaving out that very Word, which in these

Gen.

The Preface.

xxix

Gentlemen's Opinion does chiefly determine the sense of the Parliament, would have been acting not only contrary to them, but in defiance of them; a temper very different from that of the Convocation of 1562, when these Articles were first agreed upon, as will be mention'd ⁸ hereafter. But the Case was quite otherwise. These Convocations were as cautious as that, to act nothing in *præjudicium cujusquam Senatus-consulti*: nothing especially against that Act, which was made on purpose to regulate the Proceedings of Convocations; they knew the Parliament meant to injoin Subscription to all the Articles without exception, and therefore they also injoin'd it with the same Latitude.

But let us suppose, that till Archbishop *Bancroft's* time, Subscription was not made to all the Articles, but only to such as this Gentleman supposes the Parliament to have chosen out, tho' he does not (it seems) well know which those were: For tho' it was easie to subscribe them by such a general Form, as might leave it uncertain to the very Subscribers themselves, which of them they subscrib'd and which not: Yet the same Articles that were to be subscrib'd

by this Act, (we have seen) were also to be publickly read by it, and an open declaration made of unfeign'd assent to them, and nothing contrary to them maintained and persisted in upon pain of deprivation. Now all this could not be duly observ'd without knowing what Articles the Parliament meant to except; and if that were no better known then, than it is now even to our Author, the Clergy must have been expos'd to manifest doubts, and uncertainties, and had no other security against the Penalty of the Act, but by relinquishing all benefit of its pretended exemption, and understanding it of all the Articles in general: But if the Act by a Book of Articles tack'd to the Original, with the excepted Articles struck out of it, did expressly signify which were to be subscrib'd, and which not (a supposition of our Author's, for which I have observ'd there is no ground in the Act it self, which sufficiently shews it to be false) then that distinction, as unknown as it is now, even to this Advocate for it, must have been as well known at that time to every single Clergy-man, as any thing whatever; for every one of them was to subscribe, and every one to read in his Church that distinguish'd Subscription; so that the whole Kingdom, Clergy, and

and Laity must have been fully appriz'd of it; and yet we have observ'd there appear no footsteps in the least of any such thing all Queen *Elizabeth's* long Reign; tho' as we have seen there was often occasion for it: No heats and controversies about it, in all the long strugglings of that Party: But both sides take it for granted, that the Act of Parliament we are considering, had relation to all the 39 Articles, without any Exception; the contrary it seems was a discovery, more easily made at some distance, than while they who pass'd the Act were still living; their late posterity were likelier to understand their meaning, than themselves, or their contemporaries; and what no Body could discern at that time. (I suppose because of too much light, which rather dazles than directs) was more easily found out afterwards, when great part of that light was remov'd.

But we are told, that this discovery was made even in that reign; for, says the Author of these *Reflections*, Arch-bishop *Parker* himself both own'd and complain'd, that that Parliament did *put out of the Book, the Articles for the Homilies, consecrating of Bishops, and such like*, and this was taken notice of in a Speech in the ensuing Parliament by a
Member

Member, to whom this Complaint was made, and who had justify'd the Parliament to the Arch-bishop, for what they had done in this Matter: And tho' this Member was afterwards examin'd in a Committee for some bold things said in this Speech, yet he was never question'd for what he had related concerning this Fact, neither when he made the Speech, nor when he was afterwards call'd to account for it, tho' there must have been many present in that Parliament of 1575, who had been Members of that of 1571, and would have contradicted him, had not what he said been true. But was it possible, that the Parliament should except several Articles so expressly out of this Act, as to strike them out of the Book of Articles, probably brought in with the Bill (as we shall observe ^h a like *Bill with a little Book* on the same occasion) and no doubt intended to be tack'd to the Record of the Act, and yet that neither the Act it self should take the least notice, either of any such Book tack'd to the Record, or of any Articles struck out of it; nor the Party in whose favour this Exception was made, should in all that long Reign

once plead this Exemption against that rigorous Subscription to the Articles required by the Bishops, of which they complain'd upon every occasion, and us'd all endeavours to redress it? And would the Convocation that sat at the same time with this Parliament, have enjoin'd Subscription to all the Articles, when such a distinguish'd Subscription of them as is pretended, had been enacted in the last Parliament, and such a Speech been made in this to assert it? The truth therefore of this matter, as was hinted above, could be only this. There was a party in the House, and Mr. *Wentworth* was doubtless one of them, that aim'd at such an exception, as our Author pleads for; and as it is not improbable, that the words in the Act, on which this Exception is now grounded, were put in by that Party; so it is most likely, they *put out of the Book of Articles* brought in with the Bill, the Articles which they intended should be excepted out of the Subscription to be enjoin'd by this Act, and when Mr. *Wentworth* and other Members of that Parliament were sent to the Arch-bishop of *Canterbury* for the Articles, it was as natural for the Arch-bishop to ask them, *why they had put out of the Book, the Articles for the Homilies, consecrating*

secrating the Bishops, and such like, as it was for him to return the answer he did: But since this must have been, while the Act was under debate, after which as the House could have no occasion for the Articles, so they need not probably have sent farther for them, than to their own Books; that is another Proof, that what the Arch-bishop then said to them, could not relate to the Act as already pass'd, but only to what was attempted, while it was passing; and indeed it is not likely, that the Arch-bishop would have spoke with so much freedom against an Act of Parliament already pass'd, to Members deputed to him on the very Subject of that Act from the Parliament that had just pass'd it; not to add, that he must be suppos'd to have had too great a share himself in passing it in the Upper-House, to fall thus foul upon it, as soon as it was pass'd: But to put this matter beyond all dispute, since by Mr. *Wentworth's* own Account of it, this Message to the Arch-bishop was sent by the Parliament that pass'd this Act (*I was, says he, amongst others, the last Parliament sent to the Bishop of Canterbury for the Articles of Religion, that then pass'd this House*) it was certainly sent before the Act finally pass'd, for there was no time for it

The Preface.

XXXV

it after; all the Acts that pass'd both Houses in this Session of Parliament having receiv'd the Royal assent together on the 29th of May, and the Parliament been thereupon immediately dissolv'd. So that if what the Arch-bishop said to Mr. *Wentworth* (of putting some Articles out of the Book) had respected, not only a party of the House of Commons, as is most probable, but even the whole House; and the Articles there mention'd had been actually put out by all the Commons (which seems to be the utmost, that can be made of this Expression, *the Articles that then pass'd this House*; for that can hardly mean both Houses, much less them and the Queen too;) yet since the Act was not yet pass'd, that can be no Argument what was done afterwards by the Queen and both Houses: Nay tho' it had pass'd the Lords, as well as the Commons, yet it was not likely to have the Royal Assent; for the Queen who was so far from countenancing the Parliament in any pretence of altering those Acts of Convocation, which they were only call'd upon to enforce by civil penalties, that she sent a reprimand to this very Parliament, for what they at-

¹ Sir Sim. D'Ewes Journ. p. 190.

tempted

tempted of this Nature in the Case of these Articles, signifying ^{*} that she would have them executed by the Bishops and not dealt in by Parliament, was not likely to have pass'd the Act, if it had made the Alteration pretended in the Subscription injoin'd by the Canons just before. The Arch-bishop who made this Complaint of it to the Parliament, could not fail to do the same to her Majesty, who having on this very occasion sent a Message to the House ¹ that they should not deal in any Matters of Religion, but first to receive from the Bishops, would at least by them be prevail'd with, not to depart from that Message so far, as to give her assent to a Bill, that had pass'd the Houses in direct opposition to it: This I say upon Supposition, that the Complaint had been made, and the Message sent after the Bill had pass'd one or both Houses; but this was certainly done before, so prevent its passing either of them; and that gave the offence; for Mr. *Wentworth* complains ^m of this Message, and says ⁿ with great asseveration, that he thinks the Bishops were the cause of it, and grounds that Suspicion on what the

^{*} Sir Sim. D'Ewes Journ. p. 186.

¹ Ibid. p. 238.

^m Ibid. ⁿ Ibid. p. 239.

The Preface.

xxxvii

Arch-bishop had said to him, and the other Members sent to him on this occasion; concluding that they, who would tax the House for not *referring themselves wholly to the Bishops*, with regard to the Articles of Religion, to which they were to enjoin Subscription, were the likeliest Persons to procure a Message to the House from the Queen, that *they should not deal in matters of Religion, but first receive them from the Bishops*: And if this be the true Account of that Message, that the Bishops procur'd it; as it was most likely procur'd upon the first bringing in of the Bill, to prevent its passing either House; (it being most proper to obviate such a mischief in the beginning) so they would easily hinder the Queen from passing it, if it had pass'd the Houses after this Message, and in opposition to it. However what had been done while the Bill was under debate, is no Argument what was pass'd in the Act: On the contrary the Act it self, as has been observ'd, is Argument enough, both what was, and what was not pass'd in it, *viz.* that none of the Articles were excepted, and therefore that Subscription was injoin'd to all the 39. I have shew'd that it is very capable of this meaning, and cannot be understood otherwise, for want of expressing particularly such Articles

c

ticles, as are pretended to be excepted by it: And as we have seen, that it was thus understood all that Reign, wherein it pass'd; so it has been generally ever since. The Convocation of 1603, which Mr. *Selden* pretends did first enjoin Subscription to all the Articles (how truly has been observ'd already) would hardly have made so bold a step, had they understood the Act of Parliament only of a Partial Subscription; nor would King *James* the first have assumed such a dispensing Power, as to ratify Canons that had contradicted an Act of Parliament, at the same time, that in that very Ratification he twice quotes another Act^c, which expressly provides, that no Canons or other Ecclesiastical Act whatsoever shall be valid, which are repugnant to any Act of Parliament. In the Conference at *Hampton-Court* about the same time, where there were Objections made against some of the Articles, we shou'd certainly have heard of the Bishops exacting a fuller Subscription to them, than was requir'd by the Act, had there been any such mitigation in it, as is pretended.

However we are inform'd by Mr. *Rogers* P, that about two Years after, one

^a Act. 25. H. 8. c. 19. ^c Pref. §. 31. 32, 33.

of the Reasons alledg'd by the *Brethren*, why they were willing to subscribe unto some, but not unto all the Articles, was that in their Opinion, there was no Law to compel them to subscribe unto all. I shall set down the Objection as this learned Author gives it us from their own Writings, together with his Answer to it; because his Exposition on the 39 Articles being a Book well known and generally esteem'd the best we have upon that Subject, it may seem strange, that any Man should pretend to write upon the Articles without first considering what had been said upon them by so known an Author, and if our *Reflector* had consider'd this, he would hardly have reviv'd an Objection, that had been so well answer'd. *Rogers* gives us their Objection in these Words. "We have always (say the *Brethren* resistant I know not where) been ready to subscribe to the *Articles of Religion* concerning the *Doctrine of Faith* and of the *Sacraments*, which is all that is required by Law. Also the *Brethren* in *Devonshire* and *Cornwall*, we are ready (say they) to subscribe to the third (which concerneth the *Books of Articles of Religion*) so far as we are bound by Statute concerning the same, viz. as they concern the

c 2

Doctrine

The Preface.

“ *Doctrine of the Sacraments, and the*
 “ *confession of the true Faith.* And the
 “ 22 *London Brethren* tell *King James*
 “ to his Head, how the Subscription
 “ which he calleth for is more than the
 “ Law requireth. To this Objection
 Mr. Rogers thus answers ¹, “ Since the
 “ *Statute for Uniformity in Rites and*
 “ *Doctrine* was first enacted, more than
 “ 35 Years have pass’d, in all which
 “ space neither the Brethren now being,
 “ nor the Brethren afore them living,
 “ have hitherto shewn, of the 39 Arti-
 “ cles for Names and Titles which, for
 “ number how many the *Articles* be,
 “ which *Ecclesiastical Ministers* necessa-
 “ rily must, how many which they may
 “ not, or need not, (unless they list)
 “ subscribe unto; which I am sure they
 “ or some of them, at one time or o-
 “ ther, would have expres’d, had the
 “ Law favour’d their recusancy, and
 “ they been able to have justify’d their
 “ *Maxim*, which is that they are not
 “ compellable by Subscription to ap-
 “ prove them all. Again since the first
 “ Establishment of that Statute Law the
 “ most Reverend Fathers, and truly re-
 “ form’d Ministers of this Church (sound
 “ for Judgment, profound for Learning,

¹ Ibid. §. 33.

The Preface.

xli

“ zealous for Affection, sincere for Re-
“ ligion, faithful in their Churches,
“ painful in their Charges, more profit-
“ able many ways, of as tender Con-
“ sciences every way, as any of these
“ Brethren combin’d) according to their
“ bounden duties, and (as they are
“ perswaded) to the very purport and
“ true intent of the said *Statute*, have
“ always both with their Mouths ac-
“ knowledg’d, and with their Pens ap-
“ prov’d the 39 Articles of our Religi-
“ on for Truths not to be doubted of,
“ and Godly. Yea, and the *Brethren*
“ too themselves (which now so scrup-
“ ulously, when they are orderly cal-
“ led thereunto, do hold back their
“ hands, and will subscribe but choicely
“ unto some of them) even they with
“ their Mouths (which is equivalent and
“ all one) have, and that according to the
“ Statute (or else their livings be void)
“ upon the first entrance into all and
“ singular their *Ecclesiastical* Benefices,
“ openly both read and testified their
“ consent unto the said Articles, for
“ number even nine and thirty, acknow-
“ ledg’d them I say, all of them to be
“ agreeable to God’s Word, whereof the
“ People in their several Charges be
“ ready witnesses to testify so much
“ before God and the World. Thus

far this learned Author; and what can be a greater Evidence of the Act's including all the Articles, than that they who plead for this exemption, were never able (any more it seems than the Author of these *Reflections*) to tell which of the Articles were excepted by the Act; a Proof they had no such Book with certain Articles struck out of it, as this Gentleman dreams of, to direct them; and that not only the Friends but the Enemies to the Articles had all along in pursuance of the Act publicly declared their Assent to all the 39 without exception? A Fact so incontestible, that for the Proof of it, he appeals to whole Multitudes of Witnesses, to their several Congregations, who had heard them with their own Ears. The Case it seems was too plain, if not to bear a dispute, which was only the loss of a few words, or of a little Ink and Paper, yet to risque the loss of their preferments upon it; and therefore whatever Arguments they pretended there were to prove, that the Act had enjoin'd Subscription only to some of the Articles; and as much stress as they seem'd to lay upon them in their disputes, they would not venture any thing upon them; but chose a much wiser way to secure themselves; which

which was, to comply with the Act in that very sense which they disputed, till they could procure another Act to explain it in their sense: And this we find they attempted, most probably upon the Subscription enjoyn'd by the 36th Canon of the now mention'd Convocation of 1603; for in the Cotton * Library there is the draught of *An Act for the explaining of the Statute 1 Elizab. Of Uniformity in the Common Prayer, and of the Statute 13 Eliz. touching Subscription to the Book of Articles of Religion publish'd A^o. 1562.* which, to note that by the way, seems to be a Confirmation of what I observe † from Dr. Heylin, Bishop Pearson, and the Journals of Parliament, concerning an English Edition of the Articles that Year. And the explication of the 13th of Eliz. propos'd in that intended Act, runs thus, *that the Subscription, reading and declaring of consent to the Articles, enjoyn'd by that Statute should be extended and understood according to the first and plain meaning of the said Statute, to be only unto such Articles, as do merely, wholly, and only concern the Doctrine of Faith and of the Sacraments,*

* Cleopatra. P. II. 73. p. 286. † Vindic. p. 163, 174, &c.

and not otherwise to any Article or Articles in the Book mention'd in the Act, without mention only of any Ceremonies, Service, Homilies, Orders and Order of Ministry, or manner of Ecclesiastical Government, or any such like: That any Canon, &c. to the contrary shall be void, and every Arch-bishop, Bishop, &c. proceeding on such Canon, &c. shall forfeit 1000 lib. for every such default. This is evidently that sense of the Act, which is now again contended for; and perhaps this Author, who proposes ^r to carry the point farther than his Friend the Priest-bater has done, intended to recommend this once more to the consideration of Parliament, as that Friend does ^u the glorious Subject of his Libel. But as this endeavour of the Party to get the Act explain'd by the Parliament in their sense, is an Argument that it was generally understood as well as executed in ours: So the Parliament's throwing out their Bill is a manifest Confirmation of our Sense of the Act, and that the Parliament understood it in that sense, and would not allow of any other. Accordingly when it was thought fit by a new Act of Uniformity to cleanse the Church from those

^r Ref. p. 2, 8.

^u Pr. Cr. p. 9.

Corruptions, which these Reformers of the Reformation had brought into her, as the old one had clear'd her from those introduc'd by the Papists: Instead of explaining away the intention and meaning of those two Acts of Queen *Elizabeth*, which these Gentlemen by the Bill now mention'd would fain have perverted to their own sense; This Act^w asserts the true and natural meaning of them both, in direct contradiction to the purport of that Bill, and to the interpretation now again contended for; and expressly enjoins Subscription, reading, and declaring of consent to *the Nine and thirty Articles of Religion mention'd in the Statute made in the 13th Year of the Reign of the late Queen Elizabeth, and unto the same Book*. So that it seems this Parliament understood that Act, as including all the 39 Articles; and I hope they are at least as good Judges of the meaning of it; as either Mr. *Selden*, or the Author of these *Reflections*: Tho' there is one thing which that Party will never forgive them, and that is in-joining Subscription at the same time to *the most absurd and blasphemous Doctrine of Passive-obedience* (as one of them has the good manners to call it ^x, in defiance

^w Act. 14. Car. 2. ^x Pr. Cr. p. 9.

of that Act) a Doctrine that stands so much in the way of these Gentlemen's glorious designs upon our Constitution both in Church and State, that as this Author could not forbear reflecting ^y upon it twice within the compass of half a Sheet: So it was most probably with an Eye to this Doctrine, that he obliged the World with this Paper; since what he concludes with most certainty upon the whole matter is ², that *we may be sure we have no Homilies by Law established.* They are all to be shut out of this Act of Parliament for the sake of that one *against Rebellion*, which is so full of that *most absurd and blasphemous Doctrine* now mention'd, that all the *godly and wholesome Doctrine* of the rest, how *necessary* soever for *these times*, must be given up, to redeem us from the *slavery* of this; and yet there is a new Argument found out to exempt us from any obligation by Law to subscribe to this Homily, by a Learned Man, that supposes our Subscription due by this Act to all the rest, and professes himself no Enemy to the Doctrine even of this, tho' herein he shews no Friendship to it. His Argument is, that this Act requiring Subscription to the Articles,

¹ *Refl.* p. 3, 8. ² *Ibid.* p. 7. ³ *Artic.* 35. of *Hom.*

The Preface.

xlvii

as pass'd in 1562, and this Homily not being added to the Book of Homilies till 1569, it is not therefore within the Subscription required by this Act. Meeting with this objection in a private Letter, and finding the Author of it desirous it should be consider'd in the *Answer to Priestcraft*, tho' it may seem foreign to my purpose, and I have not time to consider it as becomes the respect I have for the Objector, yet partly to comply with him; and because it will give me occasion to inquire into the Edition of that Copy of the Articles, which was pass'd with the Act, that enjoins Subscription to them (an inquiry that may be of some Service to the main question) I shall not wholly neglect it. In answer therefore to this Objection, I think it is plain, that the Act does not so confine Subscription to the Articles, as they pass'd in 1562, as to exclude the 21st Homily, tho' added since. The Articles to be subscrib'd by the Act are those *compriz'd in a Book imprinted, intituled, Articles, &c.* now the Homily against Rebellion having been made two Years before this Act pass'd, and the Title of it, if not immediately, yet not long after it was made, having been added to the Book of Articles; for we find it in the Impressions
of

of 1571 and in all since; and the Act not specifying what Year the Book therein referr'd to, was printed, it is impossible from that reference to know certainly, that the Book there referr'd to wanted this Title, and consequently that this Homily was not included in the Subscription there enjoin'd, which absolutely overthrows this Argument: For if the Title of the Homily against Rebellion was not wanting in that Book, that on the contrary is an Argument, that Subscription was enjoin'd by the Act to this, as well as the rest of the Homilies; for the Act requires Subscription to the Articles as compriz'd in that Book: so that unless the learned Objector could prove, that the Book of Articles referr'd to by the Act, was one of those publish'd before the Title of the 21st Homily was added to the 35th Article, which I believe it will be impossible for him to do, he cannot make good his Argument. Indeed I think there is much more reason to imagine, that the Book referr'd to by this Act, was one of those which had this Title, and indeed was one of the English Editions of that Year, probably just then publish'd: For, 1st, It was an English Book to which the Parliament referr'd, for the Title of it is English. 2dly, If they

they had meant either of the English Editions before that Addition to the Homilies, they would probably have specified which, as knowing the difference between them, especially if there were an English Impression of 1562 without the contested Clause of the 20th Article, as well as there was one with it; and if that English Edition, which wants both that Clause and the Title of this Homily, be as ancient as it pretends to be. 3dly, This Homily had been added to the rest, if not before, yet at least in the Convocation of 1571, and the Articles with the Addition of this Title been confirm'd by the Subscription of that Convocation, as is plain from the Title of the 21st Homily, added to the Impressions that Year; which Impressions from the Ratification also then first printed, appear to have been wrought off after that Subscription; and nothing that had not pass'd that Convocation, can be imagin'd to have been so soon added to the Articles publish'd as confirm'd by it; 4thly, Between the 11th of *May*, on which the Articles were subscrib'd by that Convocation, and the 29th, on which the Act for subscribing them pass'd, there was time enough for printing off the Articles as they had been review'd and confirmed by the Convocation, so as
to

The Preface

to be ready to pass with the Act; and lastly, as the Parliament, which seems to have acted in concert with the Convocation in this matter, and to have by a penalty enforc'd the Subscription requir'd by their Canons, would not have omitted in the Subscription they injoin'd, any thing contain'd in that requir'd by the Convocation; so if they had excluded this Homily, by referring to a Book of Articles in which the Title of it was wanting, and those of 1571 be suppos'd wrought off after the Act was pass'd; it is hardly credible, that such an Addition should be made so soon after, to Articles that were not only to be subscrib'd, but openly read and assented to by vertue of an Act of Parliament; by which means this Addition would be of Course included in that Subscription, and declaration of Assent, contrary to the intention of the Act: If we consider all this, and that the Edition of 1571 being probably just printed off, and delivered into the House, as the fairest Copy of the Book then extant, the Parliament would more easily fall into that loose and imperfect description of it, of *Articles compris'd in a Book imprinted, intituled, &c.* than if they had referr'd to a former English Edition, without distinguishing which they

The Preface.

fi

they meant, I think we may at last conclude, that it is at least highly probable, that the Book they referr'd to was one of those English Copies printed in the Year 1571; and those all containing the Title of the Homily against Rebellion, that therefore that Homily was included in the Subscription enjoind by this Act: Nay and (all except a spurious Edition of that Year, probably not as yet stollen abroad) also containing the contested Clause of the 20th Article, as I shall have occasion to shew, that is by the way a good Argument against the Author of *Priest-craft in Perfection*, that that Clause did not only pass the Convocation of 1571, but was ratified, as he calls it, by that Parliament; and it was principally for the Sake of this Argument, that I went so far out of my way, as to consider the Plea now mention'd for not subscribing to the Homily against Rebellion.

As to what is said upon the Argument of *Priest-craft in Perfection* by another of our Modern Discoverers, in his *Detection of the true meaning and wicked Design* (as he styles it) of a Book intituled, *A plain and easie Method with the Deists*; (for there is no writing against Deists and Atheists without wicked Designs) I need only say, that what
farther

The Preface.

farther Discovery he may have made in the rest of his Book I do not know, but that which he has given us in what I have read of it, is not of the Clergy's, but wholly of his own *impudent Assurance and bold Attempts*: I say in what I had the patience to read of this Pamphlet; for it being sent to me with that Leaf turn'd down, where he pretends^b to give the Sum of that Author's charge against the Clergy; those two Pages and a half gave me such a surfeit of his performance, that I had no Stomach to look into the rest. If he has read that excellent Treatise, against which he presumes to write, with no more care than he has, this Libel, which he takes upon him to give an account of, the Learned Author whom he engages need be at little more trouble with him, than I shall be: And I shall be at very little more, than to advise him to read over his Author once more, and then tell me, whether the pretended *Original MS of 1562* was *signed only by the Bishops of 11 Dioceses*; whether the Articles were *review'd in the Convocation of 1571 only by the Arch-bishop and ten Bishops*; and whether that Author makes any difference between their being *sign'd and being sub-*

^b *Detect.* p. 43, &c.

The Preface.

III

crib'd; and their being not establisht by Act of Parliament, and not mention'd in the imprinted Book to which the Act refers: Or it be his own contrivance to couple and to disjoin these Tautologies, in order to give us the Case, as he proposes, in brief. When he has done this, because he lays the great stress of this pretended Forgery upon its suppos'd violation of an Act of Parliament, which I presume is the standard of his Religion, if he have any; let him consult the Preamble of an Act in King Edward VI's time ^c appointing Holy-days and Fast-days, and see whether one half of this Popish and enslaving Clause was not establisht by that Act, even before it was added to the Articles of our Religion; and if he will take the pains to look a little higher in the Statute Book, let him consider whether the other part of it, Popish as it is, be not establisht by that very Act ^d of Parliament, which threw off the Authority of the Church of Rome. If after this he will vouchsafe to peruse the ensuing Treatise, I hope he will there find, that this Clause was pass'd in the Convocation of 1562, review'd and subscrib'd again in that of 1571, and as much ratify'd by the Parliament of that

^c *24. 5. & 6. Ed. 6. c. 3.* ^d *Act. 24. H. 8. c. 12. Preamb.*

Year, as any thing else in the 39 Articles; and that *all the Confidence and impudent Assurance, the Supposititious Practices and audacious attempts, the palming by Religious Juglers, which has occasion'd all the Confusions and Distractions, we have felt and suffer'd, and this done at Noon-day, in the Face of the Sun, in defiance of all Honesty, Truth, and common Ingenuity,* that all this and the rest of his ill Language, in which he even out-does the well-bred Gentleman his Author, is wholly owing to themselves and their Party.

And now it is high time to Apologize for the length of this Preface, which ought to have been much shorter, if for no other reason, yet to have made some amends for that of the Book, which like this has so much exceeded the bounds at first design'd, that saying any more in Vindication of either, would be only adding to a Fault, that I fear is already more than will be easily excus'd.

ADVERTISEMENT.

FOR the farther Satisfaction of all Inquirers, there shall be left in Mr. *Wilkin's* Hands three different English Editions of the Articles printed by *R. Judge* and *J. Ca-wood* in the Year 1571, all containing the contested Clause of the 20th Article.

T H E

THE CONTENTS.

THE Clergy now charg'd with the same Forgery, of which Arch-bishop Laud and the Prelates of his time were accus'd, need no better defence against it, than what that Arch-bishop then made, p. 1. The Method to be observ'd in this Vindication, p. 2. How this Charge was laid against Arch-bishop Laud, &c. *ibid.* What was the ground of it, p. 3. The great guilt of this Charge, if true, and of our Accusers, if false, *ibid.* This Libeller the first, either Christian or Heathen, that has charg'd a Forgery upon the Priests of his own Religion, p. 4. He charges them with forging a Popish Article, p. 5. The truth of the contested Clause a great presumption in favour of its Authority, *ibid.* Its Truth made appear, and the Power of the Church prov'd, p. 6. From Scripture, which supposes in the Church a Power of decreeing Rites and Ceremonies, *ibid.* And Authority in Controversies of Faith, p. 7. That Authority distinguish'd from the Romish Infallibility, p. 8. The same shewn from Reason and the Nature of the Church, *ibid.* As to the power of decreeing Ceremonies, p. 9. And as to Authority in Controversies of Faith, *ibid.* Shewn also from the practice of the Church in all Ages, claiming and exercising this Power and Authority, p. 10. As the Council of Jerusalem, Nice, and all since, p. 11. All particular Churches and even Sects, *ibid.* The Popish and all the Reform'd Churches, p. 12. Particularly our own, and in these very Articles, *ibid.* And that so expressly with regard to Ceremonies, that our Adversaries, tho' Enemies to nothing more, do not object against that part of the Clause, p. 13. She also asserts an Authority in controversies of Faith, *ibid.* And that implicitly in this 20th Article exclusive of the Clause in question, p. 14. And in the 6th p. 15. This Authority is so far from being what usurp'd by the Church of

d 2

Rome,

The Contents.

Rome, that these Articles were made to declare against that, *ibid.* From our Author's confounding these, it appears, he is less an Enemy to Popery, than to Priesthood, p. 16. The truth of this Clause takes off from the guilt of the pretended Forgery, *ibid.* And from the probability of it, p. 17. And renders it much more probable, that it has been ras'd by our Accusers, than forg'd by the Clergy. p. 18. And it rather lies upon them to shew, what inducement we could have to this, than upon us to prove, either our own Innocence, or their Guilt, p. 19. The grounds of the charge of Forgery against Arch-bishop Laud, &c. repeated, p. 20. The Arch-bishop's Answer to them, *ibid.* From his own ancient Copies of the Articles, p. 21. And from the Original Record, *ibid.* The Libeller's exceptions against this Answer, p. 22. A Confutation of them, p. 23. What the Arch-bishop argued from his ancient Copies of the Articles, p. 24. He did not labour to prove any thing, *ibid.* But prov'd his point with the greatest ease, and with all the Success imaginable, *ibid.* Why he did not affirm, that the Clause was ratify'd by Parliament, p. 25. Yet he sufficiently prov'd, that it had what this Author means by that ratification, *ibid.* And that by a better way, than that which this Author prescribes, p. 27. The printed Book suppos'd to have been tack'd to the Record of the Act, could not have afforded a better proof of this matter, nor less liable to the exceptions of these Gentlemen, p. 28. Witness a notable piece of Fraud, they pretend to have discover'd in a proof of the same nature, p. 30. It is not certain, that there was any such Book tack'd to the Record of the Act, but rather plain that there was not, p. 31. This Author himself doubts, whether there was or no, *ibid.* And probably knows that there was none, because he offers no proof that there was, tho' he insinuates, that the Clergy have purloin'd it from the Record, *ibid.* No Man likelier to have purloin'd it than himself, p. 32. If there was such a Book tack'd to the Record, 'tis a proof the contested Clause was in it, because neither the Book, nor the purloining of it was objected to Arch-bishop

The Contents.

bishop Laud, *ibid.* Whether there was or no, or whoever purloin'd it, the Author's Query, where to find the Articles, is answered above, p. 33. The way which Arch-bishop Laud took to prove the Authority of the contested Clause, is liable to no exceptions, p. 34. He would not have appeal'd to the Record, if either there had been none then extant, or the contested Clause had not been in it, p. 35. This had been poor Priestcraft, *ibid.* Yet the Arch-bishop appeals to this Record also in his private Notes on his own Book of Articles, *ibid.* Where that Book now is, p. 36. None at that time denied, either that there was then such a Record, or that the disputed Clause was in it, *ibid.* Nor that Observer, that writ against the Arch-Bishop's Speech next Year, p. 37. Nor have any done it since, till this Gentleman, p. 38. Another positive Evidence for this Record, *ibid.* The Testimony of Dr. Heylin, a Person of great Integrity, p. 39. This Author's first Objection against it by way of questions, and those very wise ones, *ibid.* It is no objection to the Record, that we cannot answer all his questions concerning it, so long after it is lost, p. 40. His first question, and what he argues from it, answer'd, *ibid.* His Second, p. 41. This and the next are ensnaring questions, and the last obscure, *ibid.* The meaning of them found by a sad Story from Oxford, *ibid.* He thought Arch-bishop Laud might take a printed Copy of the Articles for the Original Record, as he and his Oxford Friend take the Members of one Convocation for those of another, p. 43. This is another notable instance of Priestcraft in Perfection, p. 44. An account of our Author's Oxford Friend, *ibid.* And of his or our Author's great Ingenuity in this Affair, p. 45. His second and third Arguments against the Original Record appeal'd to by Arch-bishop Laud, will be considered when we come to Arch-bishop Parker's MSS. p. 46. His fourth Argument from a passage in Dr. Heylin concerning the burning of Dr. Mocket's Book, p. 47. He raises divers Suppositions from it, p. 48. His Conclusion from them is illogical, *ibid.* What is the Substance of his Argument, p. 49. His first Supposition is

The Contents.

not true, *ibid.* Nor his second, or if it be, it is not to his Purpose, p. 50. As appears from what the Doctor says of the reasons, either alledg'd or conceiv'd for burning the Book, p. 51. Tho' Dr. Mocket's omitting the contested Clause were the true reason of burning his Book, yet it is not certain, p. 52. Either 1st, that the Court Bishops were so glad of shewing their Enmity against Arch bishop Abbot, as our Author pretends, p. 53. Who measures their Enmity against the Arch-bishop by his own against all the Clergy, *ibid.* Or, 2^{dly}, That they thought this so glorious an opportunity of shewing it, p. 54. Or, 3^{dly}, That they had not some reasons not to do it at that time, p. 56. Dr. Mocket's Book could not shew the Judgment of the Arch-bishop &c. concerning the Authority of the Clause in question, p. 57. Nor so much as the Doctor's own Judgment, p. 59. It would rather shew their Judgment concerning the whole composition, *ibid.* If his Book had shewed the Arch-bishop, &c. to have been in their Judgment against the Clause, that had not render'd it's Authority suspected, p. 60. And yet if it had, since there were other reasons for burning his Book, it was not necessary to publish this, p. 61. Our Author's 4th Argument against the Record, taken from Arch-bishop Laud's own words, *ibid.* It is not certain, that the Original spoken of by the Arch-bishop, was sign'd but by one House of Convocation, p. 62. If it was, yet that was not the Original Articles, inquired for by the Committee, but a printed Copy, *ibid.* Which yet might not improperly be call'd an Original, p. 63. But cannot be brought in Competition with the MS of 1562, *ibid.* And that of 1571 must yield to it by this very Argument, *ibid.* His last Argument against the Record is taken from a double Subscription of the Articles, p. 64. The ground of it will be shew'd to be false, when we come to the MS of 1562, *ibid.* The Record appeal'd to by Arch bishop Laud being thus vindicated, all the Fraud, with respect to the Clause, lies at the door of our Adversaries, p. 65. As it is shewn in the remainder of the Arch-bishop's Defence, *ibid.* And their neither invalidating his proofs, nor clearing themselves all this time, is an Argument against them, p. 66.

The Contents.

p. 66. Our Author's first exception against the Arch-bishop's account of this Fraud, p. 67. Has been answered already, *ibid.* Dr. Fuller from whom he borrows this exception, could have set him right as to those that govern'd Business, &c. at that time; as he knew Dr. Heylin has observ'd, p. 68. And that in the very next words before what he quotes from him, p. 69. And so could another Author in the very Page, where this Gentleman also borrows from him, p. 70. His next exception is to the Arch-bishop's Proof, that the Clause was pass'd again in the Convocation of 1571, *ibid.* The Arch-bishop again falsely accus'd of contradicting himself, p. 71. The Libeller's dissingenuity in this citation, is of a piece with his usage of my Lord Bacon in his Title-page, p. 72. The falshood is his, not the Arch-bishop's, *ibid.* Their different Characters, p. 73. The farther grounds upon which the same Charge of Forgery is now renew'd against all the Clergy, *ibid.* The two MSS. of Corpus Christi College in Cambridge, p. 74. The Collation cited to prove, that the MS of 1571 wants the Clause, certifies the contrary; not improbably by the Fault of the Printer, p. 75. For this MS, as well as that of 1562, does certainly want the contested Clause, p. 76. And our Author has happened to speak truth, when he seems to have least designed it, *ibid.* These MSS are not the Original Records of the Convocations, to which they relate, p. 79. They are neither ingross'd, nor on Parchment, like Records, *ibid.* They have neither of them the Royal Authority, by which the Articles must have been, and actually were confirm'd, and that upon the Record, *ibid.* They were both given to Bennet College as a Legacy by Arch-bishop Parker, which Records could not have been; no single Person having any separate propriety in them, p. 81. Tho' the Arch-bishop had a propriety in all the preparatory Papers of the Convocation, of which he was President, *ibid.* All publick Instruments are the Propriety of the Community, to which they relate, p. 83. The MS of 1562, according to this Gentleman's own Account of it, is only a foul preparatory draught of the Articles, p. 84. All the Subscribers

The Contents.

Names are not to it, p. 85. If the Alterations in it were posterior to the Subscription, it has no relation to the 39 Articles; if prior, there must have been some Memorandum of them also subscrib'd, *ibid.* And that both to signify that the Strokes of Minium made in it, were design'd for Alterations, and that they were made previous to the Subscription, p. 86. This MS refers to the Autographum, and therefore is not the Autographum it self, p. 88. An Objection from the Postscript of Wolfe's Edition answer'd, p. 89. Tho' that be a Certificate transcrib'd from the Record, yet the Record need not for that reason have refer'd to it self, *ibid.* The MS of 1571 is not an entire Subscription so much as of one House of Convocation, p. 91. It is a Subscription, as there express'd, only to 38 Articles, p. 92. Tho' the mistakes be in the numbers, and not in the Articles themselves, p. 93. It seems to have some Additions to it of later date, not consistent with its being a Record, p. 94. The Articles sign'd by the Upper House of this Convocation was likely a printed Book, as that subscrib'd by the Lower, at least they were the Articles of 1562, which contain'd the Clause, that is wanting in this MS, p. 95. The pretence of Arch-bishop Parker's Authority in favour of the MSS, is groundless, p. 96. The only difficulty remaining is to give some Account of these MSS, p. 97. Which may seem a matter rather of Curiosity, than use, p. 98. Yet it is necessary for the resolution of a difficulty, that may help out a lame Argument of the Author's, *ibid.* What that difficulty is, *ibid.* This and other difficulties, that may be rais'd concerning these MSS, do not affect the Authority of the contested Clause, p. 99. The MS of 1562 was a fair draught, not of King Edward's Articles, but of a Reformation of his, antecedent to that now in force, p. 101. And that prepar'd to be subscrib'd by the Upper House of Convocation on the 29th of Jan. 1562, p. 103. Yet they did not subscribe that, but the 39 Articles, p. 104. And why on the same day, and in so much haste, p. 105. As shews it to have been only preparatory to the Record, which must bear the same date, tho' executed long enough afterwards for the faults

The Contents.

of this MS to be first corrected, *ibid.* Our Author's Objection to this Account, p. 106. Confuted from experience in parallel Cases, where ingross'd Instruments are always the last authorisative Acts, *ibid.* The same method us'd in Convocations, as appears from these and other preparatory Subscriptions, p. 107. Which are certainly none of the last Authentick Acts, p. 108. It is uncertain whether this MS. were drawn out fair, and subscrib'd again, p. 109. And whether the Record were subscrib'd, or only pass'd *viva voce*, *ibid.* Why in the Postscript of Wolfe's Edition only the Pages of the Autographum are mention'd, not the Lines, &c. as in this MS, p. 110. The Author's mistake as to the danger of a Transcript of this MS, as corrected, falling short of 19 Pages, *ibid.* It would rather have exceeded that Number, p. 111. That variation now mention'd of Wolfe's Postscript from that of this MS, is an Argument that this MS is not the Autographum, *ibid.* Whether this MS were transcrib'd and sign'd again or no; and the Record were subscrib'd, or pass'd by Vote; The difficulty above-mention'd is equally solv'd either way, p. 113. The Autographum, whether Record, or another preparatory Subscription, might be sign'd after this MS, and yet bear the same date, p. 114. That the date of the Subscription of this MS does not exactly agree with the true time of signing it, appears from the Author's own Observation, p. 115. Tho' the difference was yet greater, than he takes notice of, *ibid.* Altho' the Autographum were transcrib'd from this MS, yet it did not therefore want the contested Clause, p. 117. Some things in this MS must have been alter'd, p. 118. The proper time for altering them was between this preparatory Subscription, and the ingrossing of it, *ibid.* All such Alterations pass'd with the ingross'd Instrument, had the same Authority with the rest of the Articles, p. 119. The insertion of the contested Clause was an Emendation very proper to be made with the rest, p. 120. That and the other Alterations were actually made at that time, p. 121. Therefore tho' this MS were the very Autographum refer'd to in it, that would be no proof, that the contested Clause wanting in it, was consequently

The Contents.

quently wanting in the Record, p. 122. As appears from a parallel Case, *ibid.* The Author's Assertion, that the ingross'd Instrument would not be of equal Authority with the preparatory Subscription, is evidently false, p. 123. A farther Account of the Bennet College Acts of 1571, p. 124. And of the Subscription to it being left unfinished, p. 125. What the Author farther alleges to prove, that the contested Clause was not in the imprinted Book, referr'd to by the Act of Parliament, 13 Eliz. c. 12. p. 126. His Argument from Dr. Fuller's Testimony answer'd, p. 127. And that from Dr. Heylin's, p. 128. And therein by the way, a confirmation of the Authority of Wolfe's Edition of the Articles, *ibid.* He brings them and others to attest, what no body denies, and what those he appeals to give a probable account of, p. 129. Which may help us to discover, who tore the 20th Article out of a Copy of the Oxford Edition of 1636, now in the Bodleian Library, *ibid.* Our Author argues against the Clause from Dr. Fuller, and yet owns that Dr. Fuller was for it, p. 130. Dr. Fuller does not say, that the Clause was omitted in the Book, referr'd to by Parliament, p. 131. This is not the only falshood, of which the Libeller is guilty in this Paragraph, p. 132. Whom he means by High-Church-Priests, and how wretchedly Low he is himself, *ibid.* None of our Priests, I hope, so Low, as to think no Acts of Convocation valid, till ratify'd by Parliament, p. 133. That was one of the Doctrines of 1640, to make way for the destruction of Church and State, and is probably now reviv'd for the same end, *ibid.* Some Endeavours that way, as early as the Parliament of 1571, *ibid.* Check'd by Queen Elizabeth, p. 134. Our Author misrepresents the Protestation of the Convocation of 1562, and does not so much as construe it right, p. 135. It is so far from disclaiming the Power we contend for, that it asserts it, *ibid.* His Author tells him a different intent, for which it was made, *ibid.* Bishop Pearson is unjustly brought to attest, that the controverted Clause was wanting in the Book of Articles referr'd to by Parliament, p. 136. He does not say, nor certainly imply, that the Book referr'd

The Contents.

fer'd to by Parliament, was an Edition of 1571, p. 137. But he does say, that the contested Clause was contain'd in that Edition, *ibid.* Which is a better proof, that there was an Edition of that Year with the Clause, than 20. spurious Copies of that Year without it are, that there was not, p. 138. Our Accuser is not so angry with the Bishop, as with the great Expofitor on the Creed, *ibid.* His Skill in Logick is as little, as in Ecclesiastical History, p. 139. His last Argument, that the contested Clause was not ratify'd by Parliament, is here anticipated in defence of Bishop Pearson, *ibid.* His Inference, that if there be no such Copy now, therefore there was none 140 Years ago, is another Instance of his Skill in Logick, p. 140. His own Argument turn'd upon him, *ibid.* Arch-bishop Pearson vindicated from his unmannerly Reflection by several English Copies of the Year 1571, with the Clause still extant, p. 141. Nay, by three different Editions of that Year with it, all ready to be produc'd for this Gentleman's Satisfaction, *ibid.* Which also justifies that Prelate's Account of two of those Editions, *ibid.* Who should therefore have been treated with more humanity by a Gentleman, that pretends to be of the same Church, p. 142. His Argument from the printed Editions of the Articles in Queen Elizabeth's time, *ibid.* The contested Clause was not omitted in the genuine Editions of 1571, neither English nor Latin, p. 143. All that can be argued from Copies of that Year without the Clause is, that some of that Year wanted, as well as others had it, *ibid.* Bishop Sparrow says Day's Edition of 1571 had the Clause, and is on that Account us'd little better, than Bishop Pearson by our Author, p. 144. Why he shews more respect to Bishop Burnet, who says the same thing, *ibid.* And why that Bishop ought to vindicate both that Edition, and himself, and the contested Clause, p. 145. Another Testimony, that that Edition had the Clause, and that another Bishop's, who was none of our Author's High-Churchmen, *ibid.* Day's Edition of 1575, and all others that want the Clause, are spurious, p. 147. What is the most that can be argued from them, *ibid.*
Arch-

The Contents.

Arch-bishop Laud does not say, that the Clause was omitted after 1571 for 22 Years, p. 148. This is wrongly inferr'd from what he says, both by Dr. Heylin, and by our Author; and by the latter in all probability against his own Knowledge, p. 149. His Evidence extends only to four or five of those 22 Years: That against him is greater, both for those 22 Years, and all before and since; tho' there is more reason for a present scarcity of old Editions with the Clause, than of those without it, *ibid.* His Objections against what is urg'd in behalf of the Clause, which he would persuade us is only a few ancient printed Copies, p. 151. That printed by Renald Wolfe A°. 1563, probably the first Impression, and wrought off as soon as the Articles were pass'd. *ibid.* My Lord of Sarum does not say, whether there was one, or more Impressions of that Year, *ibid.* His Lordship might have told us, there was one in the same Library with the Cambridge MSS, p. 152. There are two in the Bodleian Library, *ibid.* Our Author argues against Bishop Burnet on occasion of this Edition, yet makes him partly of his own Side, *ibid.* It is uncertain what Alterations the Bishop means, to have been made from the Original MS, p. 153. Whate'er he means, his Argument may be made good against our Author, p. 154. The Clause could not be joisted into this first Edition of the Articles, if they had so lately pass'd without it, and no notice taken of it, *ibid.* This is the very Argument us'd by one of his own Authors, to vindicate the Faction from raising the Clause; but is much stronger on our side, *ibid.* And therefore is wisely suppress'd by our Author, p. 155. That nothing of this nature was then objected, appears from our Author's own observation of the silence of the writers of that Age, concerning this question, p. 156. Their silence, no Argument of their ignorance or negligence; but only, that the question was not yet mov'd, *ibid.* Who may be most properly charg'd with expunging the Clause, *ibid.* Till omitting it was made an Argument against its Authority, there was no need of vindicating it, 157. That the question was not yet moved, appears also from the silence of the op-
posite

The Contents.

posse Party, p. 158. Therefore this Edition of 1563 does not contradict the Originals Article; but proves that the MS of 1562 is no Authentick Original, p. 159. Bad hands an ill proof of the ignorance of any Age, *ibid.* As Bishop Burnet could have told him, p. 160. As well as his other Author, who helps him to the Argument. *ibid.* His great Heroe Monsieur Bayle wrote a very bad hand, p. 161. His next proof from an injunction to read the publick service leisurely, &c. is equally defective, *ibid.* His Supposition of an English Edition without the Clause, as early as this Latin one with it, would not have facilitated the pretended Forgery, p. 163. Such an Edition, if there had been any, would rather have facilitated the rasure of the Clause, p. 164. Yet he knows there is more Evidence of an English Edition of 1563 with the Clause, than of one without it, p. 165. He owns Dr. Heylin's Testimony is express in this Case, *ibid.* And it seems confirm'd by the Journals of Parliament, even as to the very date, *ibid.* Mr. Hamilton's Testimony oppos'd to Dr. Heylin's, tho' not inconsistent with his, or at least of no more Authority, p. 166. Nay of less; since he is guilty of a manifest falshood in the very passage, in which he gives this Testimony, and concerning that Edition which it is brought to support. p. 167. Our Author, who pays so much respect to his Testimony, should shew more for his Example, which would have taught him to treat Bishop Pearson with more manners, p. 168. His Account from Oxford in Confirmation of Mr. Hamilton's Testimony, p. 169. If an English Edition of the Articles of the Year 1563 had been cut out of a Volume in the Oxford Library, that does not prove, that that Edition wanted the Clause, *ibid.* Instances that shew the Faction to be capable of such practices, p. 170. But there has been no such Edition cut out of any Volume in that Library, p. 171. As appears from all their Catalogues, p. 172. If there had been any, that would have rather been a proof, that the contested Clause was contain'd in that Edition, *ibid.* His old Edition without date is no proof, that the first English Edition wanted the Clause, p. 173. It does not answer all the
Characters

The Contents.

Characters, which Bishop Pearson gives of that first Edition, p. 174. Which probably was the same mention'd by Dr. Heylin, and in the Journals of Parliament, p. 175. And likely would not have been quoted by the Bishop, if it had wanted the Clause, *ibid.* Nor would he have appeal'd to an Edition of 1571, to shew, that the Articles had not been alter'd, if he had known one so much ancients, that wanted the contested Clause, p. 176. The agreement of these Editions in some particulars, does not prove them to be the same, p. 177. His Editions's wanting the Title of the Homily against Rebellion, does not prove it old enough, *ibid.* All its Marks of Antiquity may be owing to the same Fraud, that omitted the Clause, *ibid.* Tho' it were as ancient as he pretends, it only proves, that there was an English Edition of 1562 without, as well as one with the Clause, as there were both in 1571, when it might be less expected, p. 178. The Latin Edition of 1563 received a great Addition of Authority from the Subscription of the Lower-House of the Convocation of 1571, p. 179. Mr. Selden, who preserved this subscrib'd Copy, did also assert the Authority of the Clause, *ibid.* And was not improbably convinc'd of it by this Copy, *ibid.* He must have known the hands of the Subscribers, p. 180. Some of which may be yet seen upon other Instruments, and have been compar'd, and found to agree, *ibid.* Nor was this Label of Subscriptions taken from any other Instrument, and afterwards tack'd to this, p. 181. It agrees in all respects with what it was reasonable to expect it should be, p. 182. The reason hinted for surmizing it to be a Counterfeit, is so silly, that our Author chose rather to alledge one yet sillier, p. 183. Mr. Selden was as able to have detected this pretended Counterfeit as these Gentlemen, and would have been as willing, p. 184. His Assurance, that here was no Counterfeit, did probably extort from him the Testimony, which he bears to the Authority of the Clause, *ibid.* Yet he had other Arguments of its Authority, *ibid.* He had by him the Copy from the publick Records, produc'd in the Star-Chamber by Arch-bishop Laud, and had been employed

The Contents.

ployed to examine the Records themselves, p. 185. If he had not found that, to which the Arch-bishop appeal'd we shou'd have heard of it, *ibid.* Yet Arch-bishop Williams objects nothing against this part of Arch-bishop Laud's Speech, in his severe MS Annotations upon it, *ibid.* Where there is a Copy of these MS Annotations, p. 186. Altho' this Search was made to find matter of Accusation against the Arch-bishop, yet nothing of this Nature was objected at his Trial, p. 187. Tho' his falsifying the Records, if prov'd, had been a blacker Article of his Impeachment than any, p. 188. And according to his Accusers, a greater proof of his attempting to bring in Popery, *ibid.* No notice was taken of this matter by the pretended Synod then sitting, tho' the Arch-bishop himself expected there wou'd, p. 189. Instead of any thing of this nature, Mr. Selden, that was to have been the Arch-bishop's Accuser, became his Advocate; the Assembly of Divines establish'd the Authority asserted in the contested Clause, p. 190. The Reasons offer'd in 1660 for necessity of Reformation object nothing against it, *ibid.* Nor Burgess's defence of them, p. 191. Nor the Conference at the Savoy, tho' it concluded in a dispute, concerning the Authority asserted in this Clause, *ibid.* This Oxford Copy with the scrol affix'd to it, is probably that which Burton pretended, was all that Mr. Selden could find in the Arch-bishop's Office, p. 192. Even that if true, had much added to the Authority of this Copy, *ibid.* The Instances produced to shew, how easie it was to foist the Clause into this early Edition, appear from the Libeller's own Account of them, to have been no impositions, p. 193. All the Editions of the Articles since those of 1563, except two or three that are spurious, do likewise contain the contested Clause, p. 194. Three different English Editions of 1571 with the Clause still extant, and a Latin one of that Year by J. Day had it, *ibid.* A probable Account how it came to be omitted in an Edition of that Year by the same John Day, p. 196. And in one of the Year 1575, p. 198. All the English Editions from 1579 downwards have the Clause, p. 199. Particu-
larly

The Contents.

lary Roger's *English Creed* first printed that Year, if we believe Andrew Maunsell's Catalogue, p. 199. His Testimony, that these were the same Articles with those of 1562, at least extends to all the Editions back to 1685, and confirms the Authority of the Clause it self, p. 200. The Editions of 1581, and 1586 are still extant; as our Author, or at least his Oxford Friend must know, p. 201. Yet our Author would persuade us, that the Clause was omitted till the Year 1593, *ibid.* Which discovers his or his Correspondent's dissingenuity, p. 203. An Edition of 1642, with the Clause, which seems to have been publish'd by the Faction, after they were convinc'd of its Authority, *ibid.* A short view of the Inferences with which he concludes, p. 203. Other Inferences which conclude this Vindication, p. 206. Another Forgery charg'd on the Clergy by a late Author is also their own, p. 211.

ERRATA.

Preface, Page xxxiv. Line. 1. for the Read of.
 Book, Page 13. l. 6. from the bottom, r.; and proceed.
 p. 14. Marg. r. implicitly. p. 16. l. 14. for her r. our. p. 22.
 l. 5. r. and add, p. 30. l. 17. r. easier: At least this
 p. 38. l. 12. r. the Records. p. 45. l. 4. from the bottom,
 r. Doughty. p. 78. l. 22. dele my. p. 96. l. 12. r. other rea-
 son. p. 99. l. 13. r. 1562. p. 108. l. 12. dele in. p. 117.
 l. 2. for then r. the. p. 127. l. 12. r. 1571. p. 131. l. 18.
 dele *Conima*. p. 133. l. 25. put a full stop after *Autho-
 rity*. p. 156. l. antepen. r. admission of it. p. 194. Marg.
 l. 13. r. 1571. p. 201. l. 11. put a Colon after me. p. 213.
 l. 1. r. 1612. The Contents in the margin are not always plac'd
 tight:

A
VINDICATION
OF THE
Church of ENGLAND
FROM THE
ASPERSIONS of a Late LIBEL,
ENTITLED
Priestcraft in Perfection, &c.

AS it hath been frequently and justly complain'd of, that the Spirit of Forty-one is reviving in our Days, and those restless Enemies of our Church and State, who lately triumph'd over the Ruins of both, are again endeavouring to play over the Old Game: So they could not have given us a plainer Instance of this, than by renewing against the whole Order of the Clergy, that malicious Calumny, which in those Days was thrown upon Arch-bishop *Laud*, and the rest of the Prelates, viz. *That they had forg'd the*

The Clergy now charg'd with the same Forgery, of which Arch-Bishop Laud, and the Prelates of his Time were accus'd, need no better Defence against it, than what the Arch-bishop then made.

B *Affirmative*

A Vindication of the

Affirmative Clause of the Church's Power, and foisted it into the beginning of the 20th of her 39 Articles of Religion: Nor need the Clergy at this Day a better Vindication against this Charge, than what that great Prelate then made in his Speech in the Star-Chamber, *at the Censure of* *Bastwick, Burton, and Bryan.* I shall therefore in Answer to our Modern Libeller first set down the Charge of Forgery, as it was then laid together, with Arch-bishop Laud's Defence against it; then endeavour to support that Defence against the malicious Objections of this Pretender to new Discoveries; and lastly, consider the farther Grounds, upon which this Charge is now renew'd.

The Method to be observ'd in this Vindication.

How this Charge was laid against Arch-bishop Laud, &c.

The Charge, as it was laid against Arch-bishop Laud and the Prelates of that Time, was taken from an Epistle of *Burton* to the Temporal Lords of his Majesty's Privy-Council, (of the Famous *Burton*, as that infamous Person is call'd by this Rival of his Fame) and it is laid down in these Words, *That the Prelates to justify their Proceedings, had forg'd a new Article of Religion, brought from Rome, (which gave them full Power to alter the Doctrine and Discipline of our Church at a blow) and had foisted it into the beginning of the 20th Article of our Church; and that this was in the then last Edition of the Articles, viz. that of the Year 1628, in as*

^a Priest-Craft, p. 14. in the Star-Chamber.

^b Arch-bishop Laud's Speech Remains Vol. 2. p. 82.

Church of England, &c.

3

front of his Majesties Declaration before them, &c. That pretended forg'd Article, or Popish Clause (as our *Burton Redivivus* Stiles^c it) is this: *The Church hath Power to decree Rites and Ceremonies, and Authority in Controversies of Faith*; and the Ground of *Burton's* asserting this Clause to have been a Forgery was, ^a that it was not to be found in the Latin or English Articles of Edward VI, or Queen Elizabeth, ratify'd by Parliament, nor (as the Arch-bishop understood him to imply) in any Copies before that Printed Anno 1628, with the King's Declaration before it.

What was the Ground of it.

This is a heavy charge indeed, as the Arch-bishop readily own'd; ^e and all Mankind must acknowledge what he there adds, and our Author in triumph cites from him, *that to forge an Article of Religion, either in whole, or in part, and then thrust it upon the Church, is a most heinous Crime, far worse than forging of a Deed.* But then it may become our Accuser to consider also on his Side, that if this Charge should prove false, both as it was then laid against the Prelates, and is now renew'd against the whole Order of Priests in general; and if all the Fraud that has been committed with respect to the Clause in Controversie, should appear to be wholly theirs, who charge this Forgery upon the Clergy, then a double share of that Guilt

The great guilt of this Charge if true, and of our Accusers, if false.

^c *Priestcraft* Pref. p. 9. ^a Arch-bishop Laud's Speech, *ibid.* ^e *Id. ibid.*

A Vindication of the

will lie upon him and his Party, for that, as the Arch-bishop also observes, (a) *to leave out of an Article, is as great a Crime as to put in, and a main rasure is as censurable — as a Forgery*: And then as to the other Portion of their guilt, if only forging of a Deed be punishable by our Laws ¹ with cutting off the Ears, and slitting the Nose in the Pillory, besides forfeiture of Estate, and perpetual Imprisonment; and be even Capital, if repeated; how much more enormous must the Offence be, and how much more severe ought to be the punishment, (I don't say of committing a Forgery in Matters of Religion, which yet is too much the Case of those, that have expung'd the contested Clause, but) of falsely charging a Forgery of that heinous Nature upon a whole Order of Men, and an Order so Sacred, as that of the Clergy of *the best constituted Church in the whole World*, as this well-bred Gentleman is pleas'd to call ^e ours, at the same time that he is thus scandalously reviling her? I believe he is the first, either Christian or Heathen, that has thought fit, with an Imputation of Fraud and Imposture to blacken the whole Priesthood of a Church or Religion, which upon every Occasion he calls his own; indeed calling her so after this, is only adding to that calumny which he throws upon her Priests; and yet, as tho' it were not Crime enough to have forg'd an Article

This Libeller, the first Christian or Heathen, that has charg'd a Forgery on the Priests of his own Religion.

(a) Speech Ibid p. 83. ¹ *Act. 5. Eliz. c. 14.* ² *Pref. p. 10.*
of

of Religion, he charges ^b them with forging a Popish Article; which severe Addition to the Charge because it must greatly enhaunse the Guilt, on which Side soever it be found to lye, therefore in order to shew, both how heinous that guilt is, and who are to be accountable for it, I shall first Inquire into the Matter of the Clause in Question, and the Truth of the Propositions laid down in it; and then in vindication of it's Authority, shall proceed to the Arch-bishop's Defence against the Charge of foisting it into the Twentieth Article.

He charges them with Forging a Popish Article.

Now as to the Subject Matter of this Clause, if the Power asserted in it be no other, than what of Right belongs to the Church, and what all the Churches and even pretended Churches in the World, both assert and exercise; and if the Church of England does both in these very Articles, into which this Clause is said to have been foisted; then on the one Side, as the Forgery, if there were any, would be much less Criminal, than if that Power had been a mere Usurpation: So this will be a very great Presumption in favour of the Clergy, that there was no such Forgery committed: And on the other Side, the slander of our *Accusers* will favour so much the more of the *Father of Lies*, and be a greater instance of their *Malice in Perfection*; and that this is the very case, I shall now make appear.

The Truth of the Contested Clause, a great Presumption in favour of its Authority.

^b *Priestcraft Pref.*

*It's Truth made
appear, and the
Power of the
Church prov'd.*

The Contested Clause of the 20th Article ascribes to the Church, 1st, *Power to decree Rites and Ceremonies*; 2ly, *Authority in Controversies of Faith*: And that the Church has such a Power and Authority, and that so essentially and fundamentally inherent in her, that she could not be a Church without them, appears both from the Testimony of the Scripture, which supposes and declares this Authority and Power to be essentially vested in the Church; and from the Nature of the Church, and Reason of the Thing itself; and lastly from the constant Practice of the Catholick, and of all National Churches, and indeed of all particular Sects, that have called themselves Churches, in every Age, and in all Places.

*From Scripture,
which supposes
in the Church
A Power of de-
creeing Rites
and Ceremonies.*

To begin with the Power of decreeing Rites and Ceremonies. The Scripture enjoining the Publick Worship of God, with this general Direction concerning the manner of performing it, that *all things therein be done decently and in order*, without determining the particular circumstances necessary to the preservation of that order and decency, and indeed to the very maintenance of the publick worship itself: Does hereby both evidently suppose a Power in the Church to determine those Particulars, and leave them to the determination of that Power. Now these particular circumstances are nothing else, but those Rites and Ceremonies, which are or-

dain'd and observ'd in every Church, as is judg'd to conduce most to the decency and order of the publick worship of God; and therefore the same Scripture, that commands that worship, and this decency and order in it, without prescribing those Rites and Ceremonies, that are necessary to both, does plainly suppose a Power in the Church, *And Authority in Controversies of Faith.* to decree those Rites and Ceremonies, and command the Exercise of that Power.

And then for her Authority in Controversies of Faith, when our Blessed Saviour *sent his Disciples as his Father had sent him, and by vertue of that absolute Power which was given to him, commanded them to go and teach all Nations, that is, to go with Authority, and make them Disciples; and in their Persons gave the same command to all that were to succeed them in the Government of the Church: (for he promised to be with them always, in the discharge of that Commission, ever unto the end of the World:)* And when accordingly the Apostle directed the Hebrews, *to follow the Faith of those that had the rule over them; not to be carried about with divers and strange Doctrines, but to obey them that had the rule over them, and submit themselves; for, says he, they watch for your Souls, as they that must give Account, that they may do it with Joy, and not with Grief; for that is unprofitable for you: and when in another Place the same Apostle*

¹ Joh. 20. 21. ² Mat. 28, 18, 19. ³ Ibid. v. 20.
⁴ Heb. 13. 7, 9, 17.

files * the Church, the Pillar and Ground of the Truth: The witness and keeper of holy Writ, (as this very Article of her Authority expresses it) with whom that ^p Form of Sound Words was deposited, ^a as a Standard (says 'Dr. Hammond) by which all other Doctrines were to be measured and judg'd, and the Truth supported: What else does all this teach us, but that the Governours

That Authority distinguished from the Romish Infallibility.

of the Church have full power to direct us in all Doubts and Disputes about the Truth of any Doctrines; and an Authority in Controversies of Faith, to which we are oblig'd to submit, as to the determination of a Competent, tho' not of an infallible Judge? A distinction which our great Enemy to Priests and Priestcraft might have observ'd, is more than once made use of by the Learned Bishop Sparrow ^r in that very Account of the Church's Authority which he quotes from him: And if he had observ'd and understood this, he might have spar'd himself and his Reader the trouble of all that part of his Preface, in which he manifestly confounds the Authority with the Infallibility of the Church.

The same shewn from Reason, and the Nature of the Church.

And as the Scripture does thus evidently both suppose and declare the Church to have this Power and Authority essentially vested in her: So the very Nature of the Church, and the Reason of the Thing itself does most plainly imply this: For if

* 1 Tim. 3. 15. ^p 2 Tim. 1. 13. ^a Ibid ch. 6. 20.
^r Ham. in 1 Tim. 3. 15. ^r Pref. to Coll. of Art &c.
 the

Church of England, &c.

9

the main End and Design of instituting a Church was, that God should be publickly worshipped in it with that decency and order, which becomes the solemnity of that great Duty; that *the pure Word of God should be preach'd, and the Sacraments duly administred, according to Christ's Ordinance, in all those Things that of necessity are requisite to the same*, which our 19th Article makes the Essentials of the Church of Christ, then,

1st, She must be impower'd to see, that the publick worship of God be thus duly perform'd by her Members, and to prescribe such Rites and Ceremonies in order thereto, as she Judges requisite to the due performance of it; and these Rites being of such a Nature, as that some of them are necessary to the very worship it self, and others to the due performance of it; and yet could not be provided for by any general Directions, that had been applicable to the Condition of every particular Time and Place; and were therefore left to the discretion of the Church her self: It follows, that her Power to decree these Rites and Ceremonies, is as essential as God's orderly worship in her, which is the very thing that makes her a Church.

As to the Power of decreeing Ceremonies.

2dly, She must also have Authority in Controversies of Faith; for since, as the Experience of all Ages testifies, there may arise Doubts and Controversies concerning the Sense and Meaning of that *pure Word of God*, which is to be *Preach'd in the Church of Christ*, concerning the *due Administration*

And as to Authority in Controversies of Faith.

tion of the Sacraments therein, and concerning all those Rules and Directions in the holy Scriptures, which the Spirit of God has given for the Good and Edification of his Church; and without the Resolution of these Doubts neither the Peace and Unity of the Church can be preserv'd, nor that great End of its first Institution obtain'd, the regular and orderly Worship of God: There must therefore be a Power some where of determining all such Doubts: And tho' the Scripture be the only Rule of Faith, and the supream Judge of Controversies, against which even the Church her self has no Authority to determine any thing, as she owns in this very 20th Article; (which answers that Argument, by which this Gentleman thinks her Members so easily perverted to Popery) yet since the Scripture is always pleaded on both Sides in such Disputes, and nothing can be a Controversy of Faith, but what pretends to have some Foundation in Scripture; it is therefore necessary, that there be an Authority in the Church, of determining on which side the Scripture is in every such Controversy; and that is the very Authority I am contending for; and this is as necessary, as the Peace and Unity of the Church, and as the regular and orderly worship of God.

Shewn also from the Practice of the Church in all Ages, claiming and exercising this Power and Authority.

Accordingly the Practice of the Church in all Ages, which is the best interpreter of her Right, shews that she always had

Priest-Craft Pref. p. 2.

this

this Power and Authority. In the very Infancy of the Church we find the Apostles, the first Governours of it, both decreeing Rites and Ceremonies to be observed in the publick Worship; as that Men shou'd be "uncovered, Women be "cover'd and keep "silence, and the like; and also in full Council determining "a Controversy of Faith; and that in such a manner, as if they had design'd it for a Model to all future Ages: or else what need was there for the Apostles, who were infallible, to debate the Matter first among themselves, before they came to that determination? And the Modell has been follow'd in all Councils of the Church ever since, as well as the same Power and Authority exercis'd; as appears from all their Canons, the purport of which is always, either to decree Rites and Ceremonies, or to determine Controversies of Faith. To instance only in the first General Council of Nice, the whole Business of it was to decree a Rite, and determine a Controversy; the former about the manner of celebrating *Easter*, the latter concerning the Divinity of Christ. Indeed I may challenge our Adversaries to instance in any Church, or even Sect that have call'd themselves by that Name, in this or any other Country, since the Foundation of the Christian Religion, that has not both claim'd and exercis'd this Power and Authority. Was there ever

As the Councils of Jerusalem, Nice, and all since,

All particular Churches, and even Sects.

¹ 1 Cor. II. 4, 7, 14. ² Ibid v. 5, 15. ³ Ibid ch. 34. v. 14. ⁴ *Act.* 15. 19 &c.

*The Popish and
all the Reform-
ed Churches.*

any, in which the publick Worship of God was not perform'd according to certain Rites of their own prescribing; and in which there was not some confession of Faith, which they required of all their Members? Those (as I have shewn) are both of them so essential to every Church, that it is only the variety of these, that constitutes the difference of all the Religions and Churches in the World; and as all the Reformed Churches are distinguish'd from that of *Rome*, by the several Rites of their Worship, and the Articles of their Faith: So that wherein they differ from one another, is also some less essential Points of Belief, and a few Rites and Ceremonies. And how could this difference be either first made, or since maintain'd without that Power and Authority, for which I am pleading? Accordingly we find them both asserted by all these Churches in the Body of their Confessions, and the latter (which alone is objected against by our Author) in the very ^b Title of that Collection, which is said to have been made by the Authority, as well as in the Name of these several Churches. And our own Church, to which this Power is deny'd by our Adversary, is so far from being an Exception in this Case, that (besides that it is contain'd amongst those others) it has all

*Particularly
our own, and in
these very Ar-
ticles.*

^a Corp. & Syntagm. Confession. p. 57. 96, 142.

^b Corpus & Syntagma Confessionum, quæ in diversis Regnis & Nationibus, Ecclesiarum nomine fuerunt authenticè editæ: In celeberrimis Conventibus exhibitæ, publicâq; Autoritate comprobata.

along,

along, and does in these very Articles, exclusive of the Clause in Question, assert and exercise all the Power and Authority express'd in that Clause. In the 34th Article she asserts, *that every particular or National Church hath Authority to ordain, change, and abolish Ceremonies or Rites of the Church, ordain'd only by Men's Authority; so that all things be done to edifying.*

And accordingly having thought fit at the Reformation, to abolish some of her Ceremonies, and to retain others, she gives the Reasons of her so doing, in the Preface to our Liturgy. This is so express a Claim of the Power asserted in the former Part of this Clause, that tho' the Party, whom our Author has the honour to personate in this Libel, are Enemies to nothing more, than to the Ceremonies of our Church; yet they are pass'd over in this Charge of Forgery, because that Clause of the 34th Article has never been omitted in their most spurious Editions of the Articles; nor could therefore possibly fall under the least imputation of being forg'd. This Clause therefore of the 34th Article, and several others in the rest, which unhappily stand in these Gentlemens Way, I shall leave to be attack'd by them from such other Batteries, as they may have leisure hereafter to erect: And to proceed to the Church's Authority in Controversies of Faith, which she does not only assert by an actual Exercise of it, in drawing up and agreeing upon these Articles of Religion, which are for the most part so many Determinations of

And that so expressly with regard to Ceremonies, that our Adversaries tho' Enemies to nothing more, do not object against that part of the Clause.

She also asserts an Authority in Controversies of Faith.

Contro-

*And that implic-
cility in this
20th Article,
exclusive of the
Clause in Que-
stion.*

Controversies of Faith; and in all her ratifications of them, and Injunctions of Subscription to them: But in this very 20th Article, and in that part of it which our Adversaries own to be genuine, this Authority is most evidently suppos'd and imply'd: for not to mention the Title of the Article, which I leave this Gentleman to account for, who is robbing the Church of all the Authority, which that Title imports; to assert, that *it is not lawful for the Church to ordain any thing contrary to God's Word written; and that it may not so expound one Place of Scripture, that it be repugnant to another: That tho' the Church be a Witness, and a keeper of Holy Writ,* yet as it ought not to decree any thing against the same, so besides the same it ought not to enforce any thing to be believ'd for necessity of Salvation; all this is only declaring the Limits of an Authority suppos'd in her, which it had been impertinent to declare, if she had not been allow'd to have such an Authority; as impertinent as it would be for any of our Church to affirm, that the Bishop of Rome has no Power in England to ordain any thing contrary to the Laws of the Land. Would not such a Declaration manifestly imply, that that Bishop has some Authority in this Kingdom? And since he most certainly has none, were it not more proper in that Case, to deny than to limit his Authority? Not to say that he has none against the Laws of the Land, which no Bishop of our own is allow'd to have, but that he has absolutely

Intely none at all; and if our Church had had none in Controversies of Faith, it would in like manner have been said in this Article, not that *it is not lawful for her to ordain any thing* contrary to God's Word, but *that it is not lawful for her to ordain any thing at all*; not that *she may not so expound one Place of Scripture, that it be repugnant to another*: But absolutely, that she has no right to expound the Scripture; that *she ought not to decree any thing at all, any more according to Holy Writ, than against it; nor enforce any thing to be believ'd for necessity of Salvation, whether besides that, or not besides it.* The same Authority is also imply'd in that Clause of the 6th Article, where it is declared, that *whatsoever is not read in the Scripture, nor may be prov'd thereby, is not to be required of any Man, that it should be believ'd, as an Article of Faith; or be thought requisite or necessary to Salvation.* This Limitation therefore of her Authority in this Case, is not denying, but supposing and allowing it; declaring within what Limits she may lawfully exercise it, according to the known Rule, *Exceptio firmat Regulam*; and so evidently implying her Right, both to ordain Ceremonies, and to determine Controversies of Faith within those Limits, that this Article without the Affirmative Clause was for Ten Years together thought a sufficient Declaration of the Church's Power and Authority in that regard; and nothing but the Addition of that Clause, to assert expressly what was before so plainly imply'd

And in the
Sixth.

This Authority is so far from being that usurp'd by the Church of Rome, that these Articles were made to declare against that.

imply'd, was wanting to declare it in the fullest manner. And the Authority imply'd in this, and the Sixth Article is so far from being such as our *Accuser* represents it, which is that claim'd by the Church of *Rome*, not the Church of *England*; not only Authority but Infallibility: A Power of imposing Articles of Faith, as necessary to Salvation, both besides and contrary to the Scripture: That the very design of these Articles is to declare against that unlimited Power; to disclaim the Usurpation of the *Romish* Church, at the same time that it asserts the Lawful Authority of her own; and in this as in several other of the Articles, to shew the difference between her Corruptions, and our Reformation. By

By our Author's Confounding these, it appears he is less an Enemy to Popery, than to Priesthood.

this it evidently appears, that our Author with all his Zeal against the Church of *Rome* is not so much an Enemy to Popery as to Priesthood; since he can overlook those Limitations of our Church's Power, which are made in this Article, on purpose to distinguish it from what the *Romish* Church usurps; and uses Arguments against the Lawful Authority of the one, which only hold good against the pretended infallibility of the other.

The Truth of this Clause takes off from the guilt of the pretended Forgery.

Since therefore the Subject Matter of the Affirmative Clause of the Church's Power is thus certainly true, as it appears both from Scripture, and the Nature of the Church, and the constant Practice of all Ages; since every Church must of necessity have all that Authority, which is ascribed to ours in this Clause; and since it is

no other than what hath been ever, both claim'd and exercis'd by all the Churches in the World, and is by ours even in these very Articles, exclusive of the contested Clause: It hence follows, that if this Clause be a Forgery, yet at least it is not a Forgery of an Article, that in it self is not true, nor an interpolation of any thing into the Articles, but what was evidently there before, tho' not all of it in such express Terms: And as this is a very great diminution of the guilt on the one hand, if we should not be able to vindicate the Authority as clearly as we have done the Truth of the Clause; so if we should also make that out, it would on the other hand be a great Addition to the Crime of charging such a Forgery falsely upon the whole Clergy. And nothing can be a greater presumption of the falsity of that charge, than the truth of the Clause alledg'd to be forg'd, and that all the Power asserted in it was actually contain'd in the Articles before; for tho' it was certainly worth while to add to the Articles an express Affirmation of a Power and Authority, which was part of it only imply'd in them before, since that Power is so essential to the Church, that (as I have shewn) it could not be a Church without it, which was the Reason of adding this Affirmative Clause to the Article of the Church's Authority, as it stood from King Edward's Time to the 5th Year of Queen Elizabeth's; yet Men must be depriv'd of common Sense, as well as Conscience, that would

*And from the
Probability of
it.*

encounter with all the difficulties and hazards of a Forgery, and risk the numerous inconveniences consequent upon the discovery of it, not to procure themselves any new Power, but only a fuller Declaration of a Power they already had, which there was so little need of recourse to such Measures for obtaining, that it was not likely, when propos'd, to meet with the least opposition: This they were aware of, who first charg'd this Forgery upon the Clergy; and therefore (as we have seen) their Charge against the *Prelates* sets forth, that they *had forg'd a new Article brought from Rome, &c.* and our Modern *Libeller*, treading in their Steps, calls it a *Popish Clause*, and instead of arguing closely, only declaims very loudly against the truth of it. But I hope I have sufficiently prov'd, that it is neither a Popish nor a False Clause, nor gives the Church any Power, but what she certainly had before, and was imply'd in this very Article without the Clause, and part of it most expressly asserted in another: After which, I appeal to all the World, which of the Two is most probable, that the Clergy have forg'd the Clause, and surreptitiously inserted it into the Article, in those numerous Editions in which it is contain'd; or that those who accuse them of this Forgery, have made use of the like Artifice to expunge it, and contrive it to be left out of those few Editions that want it; that the former to procure no new Power to themselves, but only a more express Assertion of a Power they had already, which

And renders it much more probable, that it has been rais'd by our Accusers than forg'd by the Clergy.

in all likelyhood might have been obtain'd at an easier rate, have incurr'd not only the guilt of a down-right Forgery, and that in a Matter of this Importance, which adds greatly to its enormity, but the danger, the disgrace, and all the other ill consequences attending upon the discovery of it; or that the latter should have incurr'd all this for ends that they could not otherwise so easily obtain; *viz.* to gain so considerable an Argument against this Authority of the Church, as that of the Clergy's forging this Clause to support it, would furnish them with; and at the same time to give the greatest blow imaginable, both to her Credit, and that of all her Priests in general, by such a pretended Proof against their whole Order of the most enormous Forgery and Imposture: In a word, that an order of Men generally speaking of great Reputation for their Probity and Religion, should for no Advantage to themselves or their Cause, commit a Crime of so heinous a nature; or that the Faction, with whom the End does always justify the Means, and who seldom stick at the foulest Means to compass their Ends, should overlook the Iniquity of such a Proceeding, for the great Advantage their Cause would probably reap from it. I think the probability in this Case is so manifestly against our Adversaries, that after this it rather lyes upon them to shew, that there could be any tolerable Reason to induce the Clergy to commit this Forgery, as I have instanced in such as are apparently sufficient to have put the Facti-

And it rather lyes upon them to shew what inducement we could have to this, than upon us to prove either our own Innocence, or on their Guilt.

on upon it, than upon us to prove, either our selves innocent of so foul a Practice, where we had no Temptation to it, or them guilty, where the Motives to the Perpetration of it were such, as to them are generally irresistible. At least the Proofs of a forgery so very improbable on our side ought to have all the evidence imaginable, and the Reader to entertain the strongest Presumptions of the Clergy's Innocence in this particular, till he sees the most apparent Proof of their Guilt.

*The Ground of
the Charge of
Forgery against
Arch-bishop
Laud, &c. re-
peated.*

*The Arch-bi-
shop's Answer to
them.*

And now we may proceed to the Merits of the Cause, and examine the Evidence alledg'd to prove this Charge of Forgery against the Clergy. We have seen how it was laid by those ancient *Libellers* against Arch-bishop *Laud*, and the Prelates of his time; and that the Ground of accusing them of forging the contested Clause, and of foisting it into the 20th Article was, that it was neither in King *Edward's* nor Queen *Elizabeth's* Articles, nor in any Edition of them till that of the Year 1628: let us hear therefore what Arch-bishop *Laud* had to say in his own and his Brethren's Defence, and indeed in that especially of the Clause itself. To this Charge therefore the Archbishop answer'd. * *That the Articles of Edward VI, and those made under Queen Elizabeth differed very much, and that those of Edward VI. were not then binding, and that therefore, whether the controverted Clause were in or out of them, was not material; but that as to the Articles of Queen Elizabeth, to shew the falsehood*

* *Speech ubi sup. p. 82.*

and boldness of the Objectors, he had then by him four several Copies of the Articles, all with the disputed Clause in them, and yet all printed before the said Year 1628; viz. 3 in *English* printed in the Years 1612, 1605, and 1593; and one in *Latin* published A° 1563. which was, says he, *one of the first printed Copies, if not the first of all the Articles.* From his ancient Copies of the Articles. for the Articles were agreed on but the 29th of Jan. A° 1563. Or rather 1563. The Arch-bishop does not speak of these four, as of the only Copies extant before the Year 1628, which had the Affirmative Clause of the Church's Power in them; nor pretend to give any compleat List of the printed Editions of the Articles, as the Author of *Priest-Craft* would misrepresent him: But thinks it a sufficient evidence of the boldness and falsehood of his Accusers, (who affirm'd, that the Clause was in no Copy till that Year) that himself was able out of his own Store to shew it in so many and so antiently. But my Lords, says the Arch-bishop, * I shall make it plainer yet; for 'tis not fit concerning an Article of Religion and an Article of such consequence for the Order, Truth, and Peace of this Church, you should rely upon my Copies, be they never so many, And from the or never so ancient. Therefore continues he, Original Record. I sent to the Publick Records in my Office, and here (I suppose the Arch-bishop shew'd it them) under my Officer's Hand, who is a Publick Notary, is returned me the 20th Article, with this Affirmative Clause in it; and there is also the whole Body of Articles to be

* *Priest-Craft* p. 20. *Speech* Ibid p. 83.

A Vindication of the

seen. By this, says the Arch-bishop, your Lordships see, how free the Prelates are from forging this part of the Article. After which He might well triumph over his Accusers, add, Now let these Men quit themselves and their Faction as they can for their Index Expurgatorius, and their foul rasure in leaving out this part of the Article: For to leave out of an Article is as great a Crime; as to put in; and a main Rasure is as censurable in this Court as a Forgery. Was ever any Charge more irrefragably answered, and in fewer Words, or more effectually retorted upon the Accusers? Indeed what sort of Proof can be held demonstrative, if this be not?

*The Libeller's
Exceptions a-
gainst this An-
swer.*

But what says our Modern Libeller to this Glorious Defence of that Arch-bishop? He does not stick to tells us after this, that Arch-bishop Laud (who in his Speech in the Star-Chamber endeavours, says he, to vindicate the Authority of this Clause against the foremention'd Passage of Burton (does not deny what Burton) alledges, that it is not to be found in the Articles ratified by Parliament: but only labours to prove, first, that he himself did not forge the Clause (from which Charge, says he, I allow he effectually clears himself) and secondly, argues for the Authority of the Clause from several ancient printed Copies, and from the publick Records kept in his Office. And it cannot be doubted, concludes he, but his Zeal for that Clause would have led him to affirm, it was ratified

by Parliament, had not the Matter of Fact been very notorious. Now that Arch-bishop Laud did in this Speech not only endeavour to vindicate the Authority of the controverted Clause, but did actually and effectually vindicate it, against that Passage of *Burton*, I do not doubt to make evident. In the mean time I would ask this Gentleman, whether the Arch-bishop's only endeavouring to vindicate the Authority of this Clause against *Burton*, be not evidently denying what *Burton* alledges? The Question between the Arch-bishop and him was, whether this Clause was Authentick or a Forgery. *Burton* alledg'd, that the Clause was forg'd by the Prelates, meaning the Arch-bishop and his Brethren; and for a Ground of this Allegation affirmed, that it was not to be found in the Articles ratified by Parliament, nor in any Edition of them till that of 1628. The Arch-bishop maintained against him, that the Clause was Authentick; and in answer to those pretended Proofs of its being a Forgery, produc'd four Editions of the Articles with the Clause in them, all Printed before the Year 1628, and one of them probably the very first that was ever printed: And not contented with this, appeal'd to the Publick Records, where the whole Body of the Articles was to be seen, as they had pass'd the Convocation of 1562; producing at the same time an Authentick Transcript from thence, of the 20th Article with the Affirmative Clause of the Church's Power in it. under the Hand of

*A Confutation
of them.*

What the Archbishop argued from ancient Copies of the Articles.

He did not labour to prove any thing

But proved his point with the greatest ease and with all the Success imaginable.

a Publick Notary. He was very far here from only labouring to prove, first that he himself did not forge the Clause, and secondly from arguing for its Authority from several ancient Printed Copies, &c, for the use he made of those Copies was, not to argue from them for the Authority of the Clause, (for bating the *Latin* one of 1563, he knew there were ancienter Copies than his, that might be equally pleaded against it's Authority) but to shew the falshood and the Impudence of those Men, who asserted, that the Clause was to be found in no Copies elder than that of 1628; and he shew'd this to a Demonstration from four Copies elder than that, which all had the Clause in them: And then as to his labouring to prove, as our Author is pleas'd to represent his Argument; 'tis evident, that he did not labour to prove any thing; for whereas that Expression would imply, that he took a great deal of Pains with little Success; it appears, on the contrary that with all the Success imaginable, and no more pains, than only quoting the few Editions of the Articles, he had by him, and procuring a Copy of the 20th Article out of the publick Records, he prov'd beyond all contradiction, not only that he himself did not forge the Clause (from which Charge he is allow'd even by this Accuser to have effectually clear'd himself) but that it was not forg'd at all, but had pass'd the Convocation of 1562, as well as all the rest of the Article. And was not this a most full and clear Vindication, both of himself and of the Clause against

against all that *Burton* alledg'd; and that in so few words, that far from labouring the Point, he apparently flights the Weakness of his Adversary, and is only affected with his Impudence? But he did not affirm, it seems, that *the Clause was ratify'd by Parliament*; and we are told, *That his Zeal for that Clause would undoubtedly have led him to affirm that it was so ratify'd, had not the Matter of Fact been very notorious.*

Why he did not affirm that the Clause was ratify'd by Parliament.

What tho' he had been of the same Opinion with his Chaplain *Dr. Heylin*, that the Articles themselves never receiv'd any such formal Ratification? And it is most certain they never did. There never was any Act of Parliament, as *Dr. Heylin* rightly observes^d, made to ratify the Articles of Religion: For the Act of the 13th of *Q. Elizabeth*, made for *Reformation of Disorders of the Ministers of the Church, &c.* (as the Title of it expresses^e) does at most only imply such a Ratification; one of its principal Designs being only to oblige the Clergy to subscribe the Articles; and give a Check to the Frowardness of some, who took upon 'em to raise Objections against them, as *Mr. Camden* informs^e us in his *Annals*, where in the Margin we are told, they were the *Puritans*. However, 'tis evident from the Act it self, that the Articles to which it enjoyn'd Subscription, were those agreed on in the Convocation of 1562: so that if this Injunction to subscribe them,

Yet he sufficiently prov'd, that it had what this Author means by that Ratification.

^d *Exam. Hist.* p. 146, 147. • *Act* 13. *Eliz.* c. 12.
^e *Annal. Eliz.* ad *An.* 1571. p. 216.

implied

imply'd a Ratification of the Articles, then were they the Articles of 1562, that were thus ratify'd by Parliament; and consequently the Arch-bishop having prov'd, by an authentick Copy from the publick Records, that the controverted Clause was contain'd in the Articles of 1562; this was at the same time an incontestable Proof, that the Clause was also ratify'd by Parliament. Either therefore this Great Man was unwilling to give any Countenance to those, who as Dr. Heylin says * of Fuller, do so dream of the Power of Parliaments in Matters of Religion, that they will not suffer any Act of Convocation to be obligatory to the Subject, till confirm'd by Parliament, and therefore, that he might not seem to lay too much stress upon a Ratification, which was only oblique and implicit at the best, chose rather to shew, that the controverted Clause was in the original Articles pass'd in the Convocation of 1562, than in those to which the Act of Parliament obliged the Clergy to subscribe: Or else knowing that those Articles to which the Parliament enjoin'd Subscription, were the very same which were pass'd in that Convocation, he took this Method to prove, that the Clause in question had the Authority both of the Convocation and of the Parliament. How then was this *Matter of Fact very Notorious*, that the Clause of the Church's Power was not in the Articles, to which Subscription was injoin'd by the Act of the 13th of Q. Eliza-

* Exam. Hist. Ubi sup.

beth, which is what our Author means by its not being ratify'd by Parliament, when 'tis evident from the very Account which he gives^b of that Act, that the Articles therein specified, were those of the Convocation of 1562, in which the Arch-bishop prov'd that Clause was contain'd, from the very Records of that Convocation? And what better way could the Arch-bishop take to prove, that the Clause was in the Articles specify'd by that Act? Why those Articles, it seems, were compriz'dⁱ in an imprinted Book, and if I may guess at our Libeller's meaning by what he intimates^k above, of the most compleat Evidence in the World, that might have been deriv'd from thence; and of^l our having no other way of knowing the Fact in question; he would have had the Arch-bishop produce that very Book, and shew that the controverted Clause was in it. And by what Method should he have prov'd, that the Book so produced had been the very Book mention'd in the Act? Not, I hope, by that which himself makes^m use of afterward to prove, that his spurious Edition was the same referr'd to there, because it was printed, forsooth, in the same Year; as tho' the Act pass'd in the Year 1571, could not ratify the Articles upon a Book printed any Year before, as well as the Convocation of that Year subscrib'd the same Articles upon a printed Copy of the Year

And that by a better way than that which this Author prescribes.

^b Priestcraft. p. 11. ⁱ AH. 13 Eliz. c. 12. ^k Priestcraft. p. 13. ^l id. p. 12. ^m id. p. 16, 17.

1563, as appears from the original Subscriptions of the lower House affix'd to that Copy, and still extant, as I shall have occasion to mention more at large hereafter. But farther, he tells ⁿ us, that the Act pass'd *in the beginning of the Year*, and how does he know, that his Book was not printed afterwards? However, does the Act specify any particular Edition? It says indeed, that the *Articles* there injoin'd to be subscrib'd, are *compriz'd in a Book imprinted*, but is so far from mentioning in what Year it was printed, that it distinguishes the Book by no other Title, than what is common, as far as I can find, to all the *English* Books of Articles, that have been ever printed to this very Day. But he seems to think that the Book referr'd to by the Parliament, was tack'd to the original Record of the Act; for the chief Intimation he gives us above, from which I conjecture what Proof he would have had in this Case, is, that in this Matter *the most compleat Evidence in the World*, ^o would have been *the*

The printed Book suppos'd to have been tack'd to the Record of that Act, could not have afforded a better Proof of this Matter, nor less liable to the Exceptions of these Gentlemen.

Appearance of the imprinted Book it self, tack'd to the Record, so that he seems to have expected, that the Arch-bishop in Proof of this Point, should have produced (if not that Record and the Book with it, yet) at least an authentick Copy of the 20th Article taken out of the very Book. And what if he had? Was that Book it self, however tack'd to the original Record of the Act of Parliament, any more than

an authentick Copy of the original Articles? And was not the Copy, which the Arch-bishop produced from the Records of Convocation, also an authentick Copy of the same Original? As therefore a Transcript from that Book, which would have been only one Copy from another, must have been consequently of less Authority, than what the Arch-bishop produced, which was a Copy from the Original: So the Book itself, being no more than a Copy from the same Original, would consequently have been of no more Authority; at least, only of so much more, as one authentick Copy might be thought preferable to another, which was also authentick. And yet if those antient *Libellers* had been as captious as our modern Ones, tho' the Record of Parliament itself had been produced, with the Book of Articles tack'd to it, they would have bore him in hand, that this was all Fraud and Forgery; that either the right Book had been taken away, and a forg'd Copy put in the room of it by the Contrivance of the *Prelates*, and that nothing was easier than such a Change; or that there had been no Book originally tack'd to the Record (for the Act does not say there was) and that therefore the very tacking of this was a Forgery: For these Gentlemen are so very quick-sighted, so well vers'd in all the Methods of Imposture, that nothing of that Nature can escape them. It was just such a notable Piece of Fraud, that this Gentleman's Intelligencer

Witness a notable Piece of Fraud they pretend to have discover'd in a Proof of the same Nature.

gencer from Oxford could not but observe as to one of the Latin Copies of the Articles there, printed in the Year 1563, to the Velum Cover of which (says he) is pasted a long Scrole of Names, of the suppos'd Subscriber's of the Articles of 1562. This is that Copy subscrib'd by the lower House of Convocation in the Year 1571, of which I spoke just now. And if he had look'd a little more narrowly, and found that this Scrole is not pasted, but tack'd to the Book of Articles (as I am assur'd by one that has examin'd it with less Prejudice, I believe, and with more Accuracy than he) 'tis likely he would have thought the Forgery more palpable, because it may seem something easier at least; this would have been as wise a Reason to have increas'd the Suspicion of this sagacious Enquirer, as that he alleges for the first Occasion of it, viz. because the Names of the Members of two different Convocations, held at the distance of about Nine Years from one another, were not, forsooth, all the same; and indeed how was it possible they should? But I shall have occasion to speak more of that hereafter.

To return therefore to Arch-Bishop Land. If he had laid never so much stress upon the pretended Ratification of the Articles by Parliament, and of the controverted Clause with them; and the Proof of such a Ratification of the Clause, from the Book suppos'd to have been tack'd to the origi-

nal Record of that Act, had not been liable. *It is not certain that there was any such Book tack'd to the Record of that Act, but rather plain that there was not.* to all the Difficulties abovemention'd; yet since (as I hinted above) the Act it self says nothing of any Book so tack'd to it, how do we know there was any? Nay, is it not a certain Proof, that there was not? And if there was not, 'tis certain the Arch-bishop could neither produce the Book it self, nor any Copy from it. *This Author himself doubts whether there was or no.* This Gentleman himself, it seems, makes a Question, whether there were any such Book or no. *As to the imprinted Book of Articles,* says he, *'that was ratify'd by Parliament, either it was never tack'd to the Original Record of the Act, or else it has been since purloin'd from it: For upon Examination in the Office, where the Records are kept, the imprinted Book refer'd to in the Act of Parliament is not to be found. But could not he perceive whether there had been any Book tack'd to the Record or no? Would not there in all probability have been some Mark of it left, as well as some mention of it in the Instrument? I am apt to think, that if he did examine it, he found that there had been no such thing; or else he would not have mention'd any Suspicion of the Book's being purloin'd, without acquainting us with the Ground he had for that Suspicion. Since, doubtless, all the Odium of so foul a Practice was to lie upon the whole Clergy, upon whom he lays the Forgery, to help to vindicate the well-bred Title of his Book, and in a larger Character expose Priestcraft in Perfection on every Bookseller's*

No Man like-
lier to have
purloin'd it
than himself.

Stall, and in every Hawker's Hand, from Westminster to Wapping. And yet if there was any Book ever tack'd to the Record, and it has been purloin'd from it, I know no Man in England so likely to have done it as himself; and as I have in a great Measure shewn already, and shall farther prove in the Sequel of this Discourse, that there has been no Fraud nor Forgery with relation to the Clause in question, but what has been committed by our *Libeller* and his Predecessors in the Faction, in order to raise and expunge it: So I have above made it appear, how much more probable it was, that in this Case they should be guilty of any such vile Practice, than the Clergy, and how much more it was for the Interest of their Cause, to procure spurious Editions of the Articles without the Clause, after it had been pass'd in Convocation, and commit the foulest Practices to support them, than it could have been for that of the Clergy, to foist it into the Book of Articles, if the Convocation had not pass'd it.

If there was
such a Book
tack'd to the
Record, 'tis a
Proof the con-
tested Clause
was in it, be-
cause neither
the Book nor
the purloining
of it was ob-
jected to Arch-
bishop Laud.

But if there ever was a Book of Articles tack'd to the original Record of the Act of Parliament, either the controverted Clause was contained in that Book, or it was not: If it was not, why did not the famous Ancestors of these Gentlemen, either appeal to the Book against Arch-bishop Laud, which this Gentleman owns^d would have been *the most compleat Evidence in the World* against him; or if it had been already pur-

loin'd from the Record, why did not they charge the purloining of it upon him and the *Prelates*? But if that Book did contain the Clause in it, then he must acknowledge, that it is as *compleat an Evidence* for the Authority of the Clause, and a clear account at the same time, both who have purloin'd the Book from the Record, and why this Argument against the Authority of the Clause has been so long suppress'd; viz. till way was made for it by the Destruction of the original Articles among the publick Records of Convocation in the Fire of *London*, of which I defy our *Libeller* himself to clear the Faction; and by the stealing away of such an authentick Copy of them from the original Act of Parliament, which in all human Probability must have been also effected by their Contrivance, if that Copy had the Clause in it, and was affix'd to that Act.

And yet whether ever there were any Book of Articles tack'd to the original Act of Parliament, or whoever have since purloin'd it from thence, what I have said above may be a sufficient Answer to our Author's insidious Query in the Margin, *Whether there was or no, or where to find the Articles by Law establish'd, since the imprinted Book pass'd by Parliament, that contain'd them, is not upon Record: For since the Articles contain'd in that Book, appear from the Act it self to* *whether there was or no, or whoever purloin'd it, the Author's Query, where to find the Articles, is answer'd above.*

* Vide Gazetts of April 26 and 30, Anno. 1666. N^o. 47, 48, 49. and Rehearsals N^o. 5, 6. * Priest-Craft, p. 13.

have been the very Articles pass'd in the Convocation of 1562, all the Arguments by which I have already prov'd, and shall farther prove in the Sequel of this Discourse, that our modern Editions of the 39 Articles are all true Copies of the Articles of that Convocation, of which for that reason they always bear the name, are consequently so many plain Directions, where to find the Articles he enquires after.

It remains therefore, that Arch-bishop Laud by appealing to the original Record of the Convocation of 1562, in which the Articles were first pass'd, and producing an authentick Transcript from thence of the 20th Article with the controverted Clause in it, did most effectually clear, not only himself, but that Clause from all possible Imputation of Forgery, and that he could not any other way have so demonstrably and unexceptionably prov'd the Authority of that Clause, whether with respect to the Convocation that pass'd the Articles, or to the Parliament, that indirectly and by Consequence may be said to have confirm'd them. We have seen to what Exceptions that way of proof had been obnoxious, which our Critick seems to have expected from the Arch-bishop; whereas I know none that can be made against the way he took. If the controverted Clause was in the original Record of the Convocation, in which the Articles first pass'd, it was most indubitable, that it must have also pass'd with them, and if it had not been in that Record, or there had been no such Record then extant, as

The way which Arch-bishop Laud took to prove the Authority of the contested Clause is liable to no Exceptions.

this

this Discoverer pretends, would the Arch-
 bishop have ventur'd to appeal to it? Would he have presum'd to impose a false Copy upon all that great Auditory, not to say upon the whole Nation? And would any Publick Notary have dar'd to sign such a Copy, either when there was no Original extant, or when the Original, which had been thus falsify'd, was so very near, and all Men might have free Access to it, for any thing that appears to the contrary? Is it such senseless, gross Forgery as this, that our Accuser means by *Priest-Craft in Perfection*? He that has so much Skill in detecting Frauds, I am confident would have shewn more in concealing them, and if he could not have corrupted or destroy'd the Record it self, when he found it made against him, would have had the sense to say nothing of it, at least not to appeal to it. Yet the Arch-bishop did not only appeal to it thus in publick, where it was necessary for his Defence, but in his own private Notes, where he could have no inducement to it, but the Love of Truth. In a Volume of Articles, Canons, &c. noted with the Arch-bishop's own Hand, on the Margin of one of those Copies of the Articles cited by him in the Star-chamber, he has put down the difference between the Articles of 1562, and those of King Edward the 6th, and having scored the Lines of the controverted Clause of the 20th Article, has writ these Words over-against it. *These two Lines are not in Art. 21. Ed. 6. And* (which the different blackness of the

He would not have appeal'd to the Record, if either there had been none then extant, or the contested Clause had not been in it.

This had been poor Priestcraft.

Yet the Archbishop appeals to this Record also in his private Notes on his own Book of Articles.

Ink shews to be since added) are left out in the Latin Copy of these Articles, printed 1571. But the Words are in the Original Copy of the Articles. In the same Volume is that Latin Copy of 1571, and at the 20th Article is written in the Arch-bishop's Hand, also in blacker Ink than the rest. The beginning of this Article is left out, as appears by the English Copy.

Where that
Book now is.

The Book is now in the Possession of William Hughes Esq; Chancellor of the Diocese of Bath and Wells, who bought it out of the Study of his Predecessor Mr. Bayly, Son of Dr. Richard Bayly, Dean of Salisbury, and sole Executor * to Arch-bishop Laud. It was communicated to me in the most obliging manner by the Right Reverend Dr. Hooper, Bishop of Bath and Wells, at the request of Mr. Nelson, two Persons as far above any praise I can give them, as Merit can set them out of the reach of any Calumny from the most inveterate Enemy to Priests, or Religion; and yet I am obliged to take notice of their Great Goodness and Religious Zeal for the Defence of the Church, express'd in their readiness upon this Occasion to countenance and help one of the most unworthy Members of it. But (to return to our Argument) did any one at that time deny, that there were any such Publick Record, as the Arch-bishop appeal'd to, or that this Clause was in it? I have now by me a long and tedious Answer to this Speech of the Arch-bishop's, under the Title of *Divine and*

None at that
time denied ei-
ther that there
was then such
a Record, or
that the dispu-
ted Clause was
in it. Not that
Observer,

* Hist. of Arch-bishop Laud's Tr. &c. p. 456.

Politick Observations upon some Lines in it, that wrote
 published the next Year after the Speech *against the*
 was made, and containing above 60 Quar- *Arch-bishop's*
 to Pages close printed, in which yet there *Speech next*
 is not one Proof offer'd, to evince the For- *Year.*
 gery, either of this Original, or of the Co-
 py which the Arch-bishop produc'd from it;
 tho' the Author to shelter himself from all
 danger, that might be apprehended at that
 time from his making this or any other
 possible discovery against the Arch-bishop,
 does not only conceal his Name, but pre-
 tends his Observations are translated from the
Dutch. All he objects to the Arch-bishop's
 vindication of the Prelates and of the contro-
 verted Clause from the Charge of Forge-
 ry, and to his retorting that Charge upon
 the Faction, is', that neither the Printed Co-
 pies appeal'd to by him, nor that Transcript
 out of the Records of his Office, under the
 Hand of a publick Notary, are a Proof of
 the Power pretended by the 20th Article;
 and tho' he wou'd insinuate', that the Arch-
 bishop by his great Power *might cause to*
be printed or set under his hand (he means
 his Officers) *Copies of what renour and date*
be pleas'd to command; yet instead of at-
 tempting the least Proof of this, (which had
 been very easie, if true) he again leaves
 the Question of the Authority of the Clause,
 to argue against the Power asserted in it;
 and requires the Prelates to shew, *That*
Jure Divino, or by the acknowledgment of a
lawful Church Assembly, they have such a

¹ Div. and Pol. Obs. p. 53. ² Ibid. p. 54.

Power, in order to clear themselves from the imputation of Forgery in this Case.

Nor have any
done it since,
till this Gen-
tleman.

And as there was not the least proof offer'd at that time against the Truth, either of the Record appeal'd to by the Arch-bishop, or of the Copy of the 20th Article transcrib'd from thence, and produc'd in the Star-Chamber: So neither, as far as I can learn, has any one had the hardiness to except against either of them since, till our new *Differer* came upon the Stage; and because he knows, that Records are long since consum'd in the Flames, which (I tell him again) were most probably kindled by his Party, has therefore the assurance to bear us in hand, that there was no such Record extant at that time. Yet I appeal to all mankind, whether the silence of a whole Party, which can hardly be ever silenced, and that in a Matter wherein they are so nearly concern'd, and would be so glad to speak, if they had the least grounds for it, be not of much more weight to prove, that there was then such a Record extant; than all that this Gentleman advances, with so much Confidence, and so little Reason (as I shall presently shew) against that *pretended Record*, as he calls it.

Another positive
Evidence for
this Record.

But before I consider what he advances against this Record, I have another positive Evidence for it, besides that of the Arch-bishop; and that is his Chaplain Dr. *Heylin's*, who says, as our *Author* himself quotes him, *that having occasion to consult the Re-*

cords of Convocation, be found this controverted Clause of the Church's Power verbatim, and the Dr. ushers in this Testimony with a very becoming assurance in these Words: Thus much, says he, 'I can say of mine own Knowledge. So that here we have the Testimony of an Eye witness, both that there was then such a Record Extant, and that the disputed Clause was in it: And the Eye-witness a Person of such unquestionable Integrity, that as few Men have writ more upon the Subject of History than he, so we have little History that is generally esteem'd of more Authority; and tho' he does not quote his Authors, as often as might be wish'd, yet they who examine his Writings will find, that he advances no Facts, but what are capable of good Proof.

The Testimony of Dr. Heylin, a Man of great Integrity.

And now let us see what our *Detector of Priest Craft* has to say against this Original Record of the Articles. His first Exceptions to it are by Way of Question, and he asks some very wise ones upon this Occasion, as 1st, on what Day this Record was agreed to, and subscrib'd? 2dly, by whom? and 3dly, in what Manner? Has he forgot then, that this Record has been long since burnt, and that we do not pretend to have any other Authentick Copies of it remaining, but those Printed Editions of the Articles, which are no farther Authentick, than as they agreed with that Original; and are none of them allow'd by him to be of any Authority, but those spurious ones, which are

This Author's first Objection against it, by way of Questions, and those very wise ones.

* Exam. Hist. P. 1. p. 144. * Priestcraft p. 38.

It is no Objection to the Record, that we can't answer all his Questions concerning it, so long after it is lost.

His first Question, and what he argues from it answered.

really of none? Or is it because he knows this, and thinks his Questions unanswerable, now the Original is lost, that therefore he is so wise to ask them? And what if we were not able to answer these Questions, does that prove that there was no such Record? It only proves, that we can now give no very particular account of it, which is no great wonder, considering that it is now above 40 Years since it was destroyed, and that thro' the misery and confusion of that unnatural Rebellion, which was rais'd and carried on by those of our Author's Party and Principles, it had probably not been look'd into for many Years before. But let us see what use he makes of these Questions. If, As to that of the time when the Record was subscrib'd, *if it was*, says he, *before Arch-bishop Parker's MS. was subscrib'd, it can be of no validity to establish the Authority of the Controverted Clause, the subsequent Subscription of Parker's MS. nulling all former Subscription.* As to Arch-bishop Parker's MS. and the Subscription to it, I shall consider that in its Place; but why must our Record have been subscrib'd before that MS? I suppose only to render the Subscription invalid. He would not put the Case, that it was subscrib'd after that, because he had nothing to except against that Supposition; and therefore we are here attack'd by this egregious Disputant, with a most formidable Di-

* Ibid.

lemma, that consists only of one Member: but it may be, when I come to speak more particularly of that MS. I may, in return for this Gentleman's great Friendship and Civility to the Clergy, help him to a difficulty, that seems to press hard upon the other Branch of this Argument; in the mean time I proceed to his 2d Question, *His Second.* and that is, *"by whom was this Record subscribed?"* And why does he ask this Question? Because, says he, unless it was subscrib'd by both Houses of Convocation, it is of no Validity against a Record subscrib'd by both Houses, as Arch-bishop Parker's is. It is not time yet to speak to Arch-bishop Parker's MS. but why does our Author fancy, that the original Record appeal'd to by the Arch-bishop was not subscrib'd by both Houses of Convocation? Does he again choose that side of the Question for us, because he knows not how to answer the other? No, there is more Mystery in this, as may be discover'd by his next Question, which is, *in what manner is this Record subscrib'd?* *This and the next are insinuating Questions. and the last obscure.* These two are ensnaring Questions, and the last not easily understood, but that in the following Words he acquaints us with the Meaning and Design of them both, beginning his Story with a Preface of great Astonishment. *In my Enquiries,* says he, *I meet with something very strange, and that, for ought I know, Arch-bishop Laud may call Subscription.* And now comes the dismal *The meaning of them found by a sad Story from Oxford.* Story. *A Friend at Oxford,* says he, *writes*

me word, that there are two Latin Copies of the Articles printed in the Year 1562, by Renald Wolfe, wherein the Clause of the Church's Power is inserted. This is very true, but, it may be, our Author may think it strange, that two such antient Copies with the Clause in them, and both in one Place, should so long have escap'd the Hands of such as he and his Friends, who in all likelihood have been too busy with some of the Copies of the Articles there, as we shall see anon; and as their Ancestors procur'd as many spurious Editions of the Articles as they could: So we have too much Reason to suspect, that these their Successors have been as zealous in destroying those of any Antiquity, that were genuine. But to go on with his Friend's Account from Oxford. And, says he, I cannot but observe a notable Piece of Fraud, as to one of those Copies, to the Vellum Cover of which is pasted (I have observ'd that he should have said rack'd) a long Scrole of Names, of the suppos'd Subscribers to the Articles of 1562. Why this is a strange thing indeed: but would he have had the Arch-bishop call a Scrole of Subscribers Names any thing else but their Subscription? No, this is not the Gentleman's Meaning; he does not know but the Arch-bishop may call this the Subscription of the original Record of the Articles of 1562; for it is against that Record he is here arguing; and this was also the Reason of his second Question, by whom that Record was subscrib'd; And of his arguing thereupon, that it would be invalid,

if subscrib'd by only one of the Houses of Convocation: Because this Scrole contains the Names only of the lower House. And does not he know, but the Arch-bishop may have taken this for the original Subscription of the Convocation in 1562? This I confess would be very strange; for *ought* he knows then, the Arch-bishop might take a printed Copy of the Articles for the original Record. It seems his Knowledge is not very great; and yet I should think, that even he was hardly capable of imagining, that the first original Subscription of the Articles was made to a printed Copy of them; but that I find both him and his Oxford Friend committing as great a Blunder as that in the Sequel of this Account. The Friend in first making the Blunder, and he in so readily giving in to it, unless he had rather have his Honesty question'd than his Parts; and only pretends not to discover it, because he thinks it makes for his Purpose. I have given a Hint of this Mistake, to say no worse of it, already, and it is in the wise Account his Friend gives of that notable Piece of Fraud, which he could not but discover in this Matter: For thus he came to discover the Fraud. *But when, says he, I came to compare these Names (he means those in the Label affix'd to the printed Copy) with those which Mr. Strype has given us out of Corpus Christi College Library, that are subscrib'd to Arch-bishop Parker's MS. of 1562, I found them quite different;*

This is a
notable Instance
of Priest-Craft
in Perfection.

for tho' some of the Names are the same with these (then it seems they are not quite different) yet is it commonly (but neither is that quite) by other Titles. So that, as he infers very gravely, neither the Prolocutor nor the Members (he means not, all of them) could be the same that subscrib'd the Articles of 1562. And is not this another notable Instance of Priest-Craft in Perfection? What, were the Forgers of these pretended Subscribers Names, as he calls them, so stupid, that they could not distinguish between the Members of two different Convocations? Or is our Detector of Fraud, and his Friend no wiser, than to conclude a Subscription of the Convocation of 1571 to be a Forgery, because the Names of the Subscribers are not all the same, with those of the Convocation of 1562? I hope the University of Oxford will think of some way proper to thank this Gentleman for charging so gross a Forgery upon them, however he is pleas'd to soften it with the Title of a Piece of Artifice us'd at Oxford, to give Credit to the controverted Clause.

An Account
of our Author's
Oxford Friend.

In the mean time I will acquaint him what I meet with upon this Subject in my Enquiries. A Friend of mine at Oxford, writes this Account concerning our Author's Oxford Friend. I take him, says he, to have been a certain Gentleman, whom I will not name, who at the beginning of May last came to the Publick Library, and desired me to shew him all our Copies, he being requested (he said) by a Friend of his to consult them

for his Use; and he had then his Friend's Letter in his Hand. I did not imagine, says he, that a Book was upon the Anvil, but thought it had been only for private Satisfaction, otherwise I should have been a little more curious in the Affair, and more nice in my Observations at that time. Thus much for this Gentleman's Correspondent: And then as to the Argument he uses, to prove the Scrole of Subscribers annex'd to the Latin Copy of the Articles there to be a Forgery; That Person, says this Gentleman, made use of the very same Argument to me, to shew them to be Counterfeit, and carried me to the Place in Mr. Strype's Annals; but I immediately reply'd, that 'twas no wonder, that the Names in this Scrole, and those in that Author were quite different, when they were the Names of Subscribers in two quite different Convocations; those in Strype, in the Convocation of 1563, and those in our Bodleian Scrole, in the Convocation of 1571. When I made this Reply, there was a third Person by—— who presently concurr'd in what I alledg'd: Nor did that Gentleman think fit to offer any thing against the Reply, well knowing that his Opinion could not well be defended. Now from this Account it is

And of his
or our Author's
great Ingenuity
in this Affair.

most highly probable, that this Gentleman was our Adversary's Intelligencer, as to what relates to the Bodleian Copies of the Articles; and that he furnish'd him with this doubtful Argument against the Authority of their Scrole of Subscribers. Either therefore he acquainted him at the same time with the Reply to it, with which himself

was

was silenc'd, or he did not: If he did not, he was guilty of great dissingenuity, both with respect to the Truth, in Prejudice to which he advanced an Argument, which he knew to have nothing in it; and also with regard to his Correspondent, whom he wilfully betray'd into the most shameful Blunder, instead of sending him a right Information. But if he did acquaint him with the Answer, at the same time that he sent him the Objection, then our Author's Ingenuity is upon the level with his Judgment, either in urging the Objection at all, if he had the Sense to see that the Answer was satisfactory, or in urging it without endeavouring to obviate the Answer, if he thought it was not. And yet we shall meet with other Instances of the like Candour and Fairness, which either he or his Correspondent must account for.

*His second
and third Ar-
guments against
the original Re-
cord appeal'd to
by Arch-bishop
Laud, will be
consider'd when
we come to
Arch-bishop
Parker's MSS.*

I proceed now to what he farther objects^h against the original Record appeal'd to by Arch-bishop Laud, and his second Argument to prove, that there could be no such Record in the Arch-bishop's Office at that time, is, that the *original Articles were left with Arch-bishop Parker* (as appears from the *Postscript* of the Latin Edition of them printed Anno. 1563, and cited by himⁱ from Bishop Pearson) and that they were given by him as a Legacy to Corpus Christi College in Cambridge, at his Death in 1575, where, says he, they still remain. What! the original Record of the Articles given away as a Legacy? The

^h Priest-Craft. p. 39. ⁱ Ibid. p. 33.

Arch-bishop might as well have given away the Library, or the Palace at *Lambeth*, or even the Arch-bishoprick. But I have other Arguments to prove, that the MS. of *Corpus Christi* College is no Authentick Record of the Original Articles; and I shall produce them, when I come to speak more particularly of that, and the other MS. Copy of the Articles there; and then also I shall consider his 3d Argument against the Original Record, taken from the pretended Authority of Arch-bishop *Parker* in this Case.

His 4th Argument to prove, that there were no Records in the Arch-bishop of *Canterbury's* Office, proper to determine the Question before us, in Arch-bishop *Laud's* Time, is taken from a Passage of Dr. *Heylin's** Life of that Arch-bishop, which on more accounts than one he thinks fit to cite

at large. The Sum of it is, that Dr. *Mocker*, Chaplain to Arch-bishop *Abbot*, having published in Latin the Liturgy of our Church, the publick Catechisms, the 39 Articles, the Book of Ordinations, and several Doctrinal Points out of the Homilies, together with Bishop *Jewel's* Apology, Mr. *Noel's* Catechism, and his own *Politia Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*; and with more Zeal for the Honour of our Church abroad, than Knowledge of its Constitution having leaven'd this Collection with the Doctrines of *Calvin*, the Book was called in and burnt; and was generally conceiv'd,

His 4th Argument from a Passage in Dr. Heylin, concerning the burning of Dr. Mocker's Book.

* *Cyprian Angl.* p. 78. ad An. 1617. † Priestcraft p. 40.

says Dr. Heylin, to have far'd the worse for the Author's Sake, and be not the better for the Arch-bishop's; between whom and the Bishop of Winchester there had been some Differences, which the rest of the Court Bishops were apt enough to make use of to his disadvantage. He adds, that his making the Fast-days appointed in the Liturgy to be commanded and observ'd for politick Considerations only, might possibly have given some just Offence; but that he conceiv'd the true Cause of the Book's being burnt was, his leaving the Affirmative Clause of the Church's Power out of the 20th Article. From this Passage our Libeller raises various Suppositions, and argues, 1st, That ^{the} Mocket's Book was burnt out of Enmity to his Patron; and if the Reasons publicly assign'd were what the Dr. suggests; and if the Dr. conceives aright as to the true cause of burning it, then the Clause of the Church's Power must be a pure piece of Forgery. But if he wou'd argue Logically, his Conclusion should be; then there was no such Record as the Arch-bishop appeal'd to, in his Office at that time; for that is the Point he brings this Argument to prove. However be the other conclusion never so Illogical, it must be own'd to be full as much to his Purpose; let us see therefore how he makes it out. Why, the assigning his Omission of that Clause, as a publick Reason for burning his Book, would have been, says he, ^{an} so glorious an Opportunity for the Court Bishops to shew their Enmity to Abbot,

He raises divers Suppositions from it.

His Conclusion from them is illogical.

¹ Ibid. p. 41.

^m Ibid. p. 42.

that

that their not doing that, is an Evidence ^{What is the} that they could not defend the Authority of ^{Substance of his} the Clause. And then he argues, 2dly, That this Book of Mocket's discovering the Arch-bishop's Judgments (he must mean with respect to the Clause in Question) and that in all likelihood of many other Divines of that Time, whereby, says he, the Authority of the Clause was render'd very suspicious, the Court Bishops would as well in regard to the Clause, as in Enmity to the Arch-Bishop, have taken care to remove that Suspicion, by producing the Records out of the Arch-bishop's Office; which were as visible then as in Arch-bishop Laud's time, if there had been any such thing there. This I take to be the full Force of what he argues from the above-mention'd Passage of Dr. Heylin, against the original Record of the Articles appeal'd to by Arch-bishop Laud: And to this Argument I answer,

1st, That with respect to our Author's ^{His first Sup-} first Supposition, Dr. Heylin does not say, ^{position is not} that Mocket's Book was burnt out of Enmi- ^{true.} ty to his Patron; but that it was generally conceiv'd, that as the Book sav'd the worse for the Author's sake, so the Author did not speed the better for the Arch-bishop's. Which need imply no more, than that both the Author and the Arch-bishop being conceiv'd (as the Historian's phrase is) to be too much bias'd towards those of Calvin's Plat-form, in favour of which the Book was publish'd, it might be thought the more necessary to animadvert with that Severity upon the Errors of it, to prevent the Danger of their

E

spreading

spreading under the Countenance of so great an Authority, as that of the Arch-bishop of Canterbury and his Chaplain.

Nor his Second;
or if it be, it
is not to his
purpose.

2dly, With regard to his next Supposition, if the Reasons publicly assign'd were what the Dr. suggests, it is not easy to understand, what this Gentleman means by it. Does not he evidently distinguish between the Reasons publicly assign'd for burning Dr. Mocker's Book, and that which Dr. Heylin suggests, as probably the true Reason of it? Does not he here frame two distinct Suppositions concerning them, the second concerning the Reasons publicly assign'd, and the next concerning that which Dr. Heylin suppos'd to be the true Reason? And does he not in the prosecution of this Argument complain, that the supposed true Reason was not publicly assign'd? How then can he here suppose, that they are both the same? But perhaps by the Reasons which the Dr. suggests, he means both those that were publicly assign'd for this Severity, and also that which the Doctor conceiv'd to be the true Cause of it; and then the meaning of his Supposition must be the same, as if it stood thus: If the Reasons publicly assign'd were the same, which the Dr. says were alledg'd in this Case: (for the Dr. does not use the word *publicly*) But here we shall be as much at a loss to find, which way he intends to infer his Conclusion from this Supposition; for except that Reason, which the Doctor conceives to have been the true Cause of burning the Book, he suggests none, that have either any relation to the controverted

Clause

Clause of the 20th Article; or from which any thing can be inferr'd, as to the Authority of that Clause: and this evidently appears from what the Doctor says of the Reasons of this Fact. He says "many just Reasons were alledg'd for it, tho' those others above-mention'd were generally conceiv'd to have most contributed thereto. For first, (says he) his Extracts out of the Book of Homilies were conceiv'd to be rather fram'd according to his own Judgment, which inclin'd him towards Calvinism, as his Patron did; than squar'd according to the Rules and Dictates of the Church of England. And would not such a false representation of the Establish'd Religion have been censured in any other Nation; or in any Age but this, wherein there is so much liberty for all sorts of Libells against our holy Religion, that not only all the Sectaries, but even the Deists, and the very Atheists seem to be let loose upon her; and as a learned Man observes, if the Gates of Hell could prevail against her, this would be the time of prevailing? And yet this was not all; for possible enough it is, says the Doctor, that some just Offence might be taken at him for making the Fast-days appointed in the Liturgy of the Church of England, to be commanded and observ'd for Politick Considerations only, but that, adds he, which I conceive to have been the true Cause, why the Book was burnt, was, that in publishing the 20th Article concerning the Authority of the Church, he totally left out the first Clause, viz. Habet Ecclesia ritus five ceremonias

As appears from what the Dr. says of the Reasons, either alledg'd or conceiv'd, for burning the Book.

^a Cyprian. Anglic. Ubi sup.

statuendi jus, & in controversiis Fidei Auctoritatem, by means whereof, says he, the Article was apparently falsify'd, the Church's Authority disavow'd, and consequently a wide Gap open'd to dispute her Power in all her Canons and Determinations of what sort soever. This is all that the Doctor says of the reasons, either alledged or conceiv'd for burning this Book; and tho' he gives them all as just Reasons, and they really were such, yet only the last of them hath any Relation to the Authority of the controverted Clause; and that that Reason was not alledged, is the very Plea of this Argument, so that the Case he puts in this Supposition is either, that what Doctor *Heylin* suspects to have been the true Cause of burning *Mocker's* Book, was one of those publickly alledged, and that is evidently contradictory to the Supposition of his Argument; or that the Reasons publickly alledged for this Fact, were those others mention'd by *Heylin*, and those nothing relating to the Clause in question, the Supposition thus understood is not at all to his Purpose. But then.

Tho' Doctor Mocker's omitting the Clause in question were the true Reason of burning his Book; yet it is not certain.

3dly, Tho' Dr *Mocker's* leaving out the affirmative Clause of the Church's Power were the true Cause of burning his Book, yet it is not certain, either 1st, That the Court Bishops were so glad of all Occasions to shew their Enmity to Arch-bishop *Abbot* as our Author concludes from Dr. *Heylin's* Account of this Matter; or 2dly, That this was so glorious an opportunity of doing that, as he represents it; or 3dly, That

however they might not have good reasons against gratifying such an inclination at that juncture.

1st, Dr. Heylin * says indeed, that there ^{Either that the Court Bishops were so glad of shewing their Enmity against Arch-bishop Abbot as our Author pretends.} having been *some differences between Arch-bishop Abbot and Bishop Montague, the rest of the Court Bishops were apt enough to make use of them to the Arch-bishops disadvantage;* and he says, *that it was generally conceived, that as Dr. Mocket's Book serv'd the worse for the Author's Sake, so the Author did not speed the better for the Arch-bishop's;* but as I have shewn above, that this latter Expression need not imply, that the Book was burnt out of Enmity to the Arch-bishop: so neither ought the former to be strain'd so far, as to conclude from it, a readiness to take any Advantage against him, that did not become Christian Bishops. They might have Reason to take the Bishop of Winchester's Part in the differences he had with the Arch-bishop; and even to make some Advantage of them against him, thereby to hinder the growth of the Puritans under the Countenance of so great an Authority: And yet might bear him no real Enmity; at least not be watching all Opportunities of shewing it, and that with so much Zeal and earnestness, as to be concluded not to have been able to do it, wherever they did not do it. In a word, it was ^{Who measures their Enmity against the Arch-bishop by his own against all the Clergy.} not necessary, that their Zeal against that Arch-bishop should have been as ill-manner'd as our *Libeller's* is against the whole Order

* Cypr. Angl. Ibid.

of the Clergy; for it is evident, that in this malicious Account of theirs, he is only Copying his own; who for fear that even this Age of Scepticism and Infidelity would not suffer him openly to blaspheme our Blessed Saviour and his Religion, which he cannot forbear shewing he has a great mind to do, in all his Discourses on that Subject, seems to have made choice of this safer way of affronting the Master in the Persons of his Servants, of expressing his Scorn and Contempt of the Prince, by treating his Ministers with the utmost Indignity; and of testifying his hatred to God and Religion, by reviling his Priests, and insulting the ^p Ambassadors of Christ. For *he that despiseth you, says our Blessed Master, despiseth me; and he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me.* But to return to the Court Bishops.

Or that they thought this so glorious an Opportunity of shewing it.

2dly, They might not think this so glorious an Opportunity of shewing their Enmity against the Arch-bishop, as this Gentleman represents it. They might think, either that the Arch-bishop was not to answer for the Faults of his Chaplain, or that leaving out the controverted Clause, tho' likely done with an ill Design, and what might prove of very dangerous consequence, yet might admit of a more plausible Excuse, than either of the other Reasons alledg'd for burning the Book; for that this Clause being an Addition to the Article of the Authority of the Church, as it

^p 2. Cor. 5. 20.

^q Luke 10. 16.

was pass'd in the Convocation of 1552, and continu'd till the 5th Year of Queen Elizabeth, it might be pleaded in Dr. Mocker's behalf, that by omitting this Clause he had not so much falsify'd the Article, as only printed it according to the Old Editions of it in King Edward the VI's time; that he had judg'd the Article, as it stood then, would be better received by the Reformed Churches abroad, to whom he was willing to give the most agreeable representation of our Church that he could, and therefore without disputing the Authority of this Addition to it, had thought fit to omit it; this might be called only a neglect; whereas it was a downright Falsification, both by extracts out of the Homilies, to endeavour to represent our Church as Calvinistical; and also to make the Fast-days appointed in her Liturgy, to be commanded and observed for Politick Considerations only; when (as the same Historian observes) those Fasting-days were appointed in the first Liturgy of King Edward VI. A°. 1549 (with Reference only to the Primitive Institution of those several Fasts) when no such Politick Considerations were so much as thought on. Nor were these all the Objections made against his Book, nor perhaps those of most weight: Dr. Fuller acquaints us with several others, and says, the main Matter objected against him, was his allowing the Arch-bishop of Canterbury's Power to con-

² Cypr. Anglic. ubi. sup. ¹ Church Hist. Cent. 17. Lib. 10. p. 72.

firm the Election of Bishops in his Province, and citing the 6th Canon of the first Council of Nice for it, which, says the Historian, gave the Arch-bishop a negative Voice in Elections, where he shou'd dislike such Persons as the King might recommend. But there were yet farther Objections to be made against Dr. Mocker's Book, which neither Dr. Heylin nor Dr. Fuller take notice of, and those are, that in the 6th Article, the Clause that declares all the Books of the New-Testament to be Canonical, is left out; and that in his Abridgment of the Homilies, he takes no notice of that against Rebellion. Such as these Reasons therefore might be thought most proper to be alledged, as less capable of Defence, and therefore more reflecting upon the Arch-bishop, altho' the other, as of more dangerous consequence, might be rather the true Cause of burning the Book, and yet,

Or that they
had not some
Reasons not to
do it at that
time.

3dly, Whatever Inclinations the Court Bishops might have to shew their Enmity against Arch-bishop Abbot, and how glorious an Opportunity soever they might think this of shewing it, yet they might have good Reasons against gratifying such an Inclination at that juncture. It was about that time, that the King took a Progress into Scotland, where the Presbyterians were so jealous, that the Design of his Journey was to work an Uniformity between the Churches of both Kingdoms, that he was scarce settled in Edinburgh, when they be-

gan to declaim against it in their Pulpits, to condemn the Rites and Ceremonies of the Church of England, and to pray to God to preserve Scotland from them. At such a juncture, tho' it might be thought most requisite to animadvert severely upon a Book, that might seem compos'd in opposition to so pious a Design; yet since it was not, it seems, a proper Season to publish the Design, it might not be thought fit to irritate the Party, by too severely mortifying their great Favourer, that Arch-bishop, much less to allarm them, by laying hold of an Opportunity of doing it, so certain to awaken their Fears and Jealousies. This might be one Reason to hinder the Court Bishops at that time from gratifying any Inclination, they might have to shew their Enmity against Arch-bishop Abbot, and there might be several others: But it does not lye upon me to produce any Reasons, they might have for this, but upon our Author, to prove they could have none, since he makes their omitting to do this an evident Argument that they could not do it, viz. that they were not able to defend the Authority of the controverted Clause, left out in Dr. Mocket's Book.

But he argues, adly, That they were obliged to publish this Reason for burning his Book, and to take this Occasion to defend the Authority of the Clause, *not only out of Enmity to the Arch-bishop, but out of regard to the Church, Mocket's Book shewing the Judgment of Arch-bishop Abbot, and in all*

all likelihood of many other Divines of that time, and thereby rendering the Authority of the Clause very suspicious. He must mean, as I observ'd before, their Judgment as to the Authority of this Clause, or else it is nothing to his Purpose, and if he mean this, I answer,

Dr. Mocket's Book could not shew the Judgment of the Archbishop, &c. concerning the Authority of the Clause in Question.

1st How did Dr. Mocket's Book shew the Archbishop's Judgment, and that of many other Divines of that time, as to the Authority of the controverted Clause? It is not pretended that the Book itself declared any such thing, and how did it's being Dr. Mocket's imply this? Was it because the Dr. was the Arch-bishop's Chaplain, and would not have published any thing against the Opinion, or without the Approbation of his Patron? I could instance in some Arch-bishop's Chaplains, who had not that Complaisance, and a Case might be put, where less Manners would shew more Religion. But what had his being the Arch-bishop's Chaplain to do with the Judgment of many other Divines? There were doubtless many Divines of that time both of the Arch-bishop's and of his Chaplain's Judgment, and without question this was well known, but unless Dr. Mocket's Book had declared this, as our Author does not pretend, I cannot conceive how it could be known, either from the Book's being his, or from his being the Arch-bishop's Chaplain. And yet much less can I conceive, how it could be known from either, what was the Arch-bishop's, or their Judgment concerning the contested Clause of the Church's

Church's Power. Even Dr. *Mocker* himself, who left it out, might not question it's Authority any more, than he did the Power of the Church asserted by it, which he strenuously maintains in this very Book. Without disputing the Authority of the Clause, he might only choose to print the 20th Article, according to the Editions in *Edward VI's* time, to gain the more Esteem to our Church abroad, and the Archbishop, and those other Divines might approve of that Method. Indeed it appears from what has been said above, that the whole bent of Dr. *Mocker's* Book was towards Calvinism; and that was one of the Reasons alledged for burning it, and the rather because the Arch-bishop and many other Divines of that time, being known to warp the same way, the Book must be thought in danger of doing more Mischief from the Countenance of so great an Authority: Now as this was probably one Reason, why the Arch-bishop conceiv'd himself affronted by the burning of the Book, as another Reason might be, its having been composed by his Chaplain; so it follows from hence, as well as from our *Libeller's* Supposition of the Book's being burnt out of Enmity to the Arch-bishop, that his Judgment in this Matter was not known from the Book, but before it; and yet all that could be concluded from a Book thus fram'd throughout, with a strong bias towards Calvinism, concerning his, or theirs, or any one's Judgment,

Nor so much as
the Doctor's
own Judgment.

It would rather
shew their
Judgment con-
cerning the
whole Compo-
sition.

² *Pesit. Eccl. Angl. c. 11. p. 347. &c.*

ment, would rather shew, what they thought of the whole Composition in general, than of one particular part of it, especially the omission of a single Clause, which might be left out, and its Authority not call'd in Question. But,

If his Book had shew'd the Arch-bishop, &c. to have been in their Judgment against the Clause, that had not render'd its Authority suspected.

2dly, Suppose this Book had shew'd the Arch-bishop and other Divines of that time to have been in their Judgments against the Clause in question, why must that render the Authority of it suspected? Was not both the Arch-bishop, and many Divines of that time notoriously inclin'd to *Calvinism*? And did this lay the Doctrines of our Church, which are opposite to the Errors of *Calvinism*, under any Suspicion of Falseness? If it be enough to bring the Authority of the least Clause of an Article into Suspicion, that some Persons even of Consideration are against it in their Judgment; if our Author be the Man some time since describ'd in one of the publick Prints, as he is generally suppos'd to be, I am afraid no one will be apter than he, to make this an Argument against the Authority, not only of this and all the rest of the Articles of our Church, that do not agree with the Judgment of that *Pure Sect*, which he is pleas'd to personate in this *Libel*, but against that of all the Articles in general, even those that relate to the Truth of the Scriptures, and the very Being of a God; since I have undoubted Proof, that it is the avow'd Opinion of that Gentleman, that some Men of Consideration do not stick to call the most sacred of those Truths into question. But,

3dly,

adly, If Dr. *Mocker's* Book had by this means render'd the Authority of the controverted Clause suspected, yet since there were other just Reasons alledg'd for burning it, there might be sufficient Cause not to publish this at that Juncture, as I observ'd above; and our Author must shew that there could not, before he takes upon him to conclude, from their omitting to alledge this Reason, that therefore they were not able to make good the Authority of the Clause.

*And yet if it
had, since there
were other Rea-
sons for burning
his Book, it
was not neces-
sary to publish
this.*

And now 'tis high time to proceed to this Gentleman's fifth Argument against the original Record of the Articles, appeal'd to by Arch-bishop *Laud*; and that he pretends to draw "from the Arch-bishop's own Words, who in 1643 being sent to by a Committee of the House of Commons, for an Account under his Hand of what Originals he had of the Articles of Religion establish'd 1562 and 1571, return'd this Answer,* with respect to the former: *The original Articles of 1562, with many Hands to them, I did see and peruse there, [viz. in his Paper Study at Lambeth] but whether the Bishops Hands were to them or not, I cannot remember.* From which words our Accuser argues, that those original Articles, which he concludes to be the same with those alledg'd by the Arch-bishop in the Star-Chamber, being subscrib'd by only one House of Convocation, could be of no Authority in opposition to Arch-bishop *Parker's* MS. which is subscrib'd by both Hou-

*Our Author's
fifth Argument
against the Re-
cord taken from
Arch-bishop
Laud's own
Words.*

* *Priest-Craft.* p. 43. * *Hist. of his Troubles,* p. 208.
ses.

ses. As to Arch-bishop Parker's MS. I shall speak to it presently. But with respect to the original Articles here mention'd by Arch-bishop Land, I answer, *It is not certain, that the Original spoken of by the Arch-bishop, was sign'd but by one House of Convocation.* 1st, It is not certain that this Original was sign'd only by one House of Convocation: The Arch-bishop does not say this, he only says, *That whether the Bishops' Hands were to it or not, he cannot remember.* I hope it is no Fault that he would not be positive, where his Memory fail'd him, and he that had so much Business perpetually upon his Hands, and that of the greatest Importance, and had been so long in close Prison, and under all the Inquietudes, that can disturb a guiltless Mind, may be allow'd in above Six Years time (for it was so long since his Speech in the Star-Chamber) to forget a particular Circumstance of this nature. But,

If it was, yet that was not the original Articles enquired for by the Committee, but a printed Copy.

2^{dly}, If the original Articles here mention'd by Arch-bishop Land were really sign'd by only one House of Convocation, then in all Probability the Arch-bishop here meant that Latin Copy of the first Edition of the Articles, which was sign'd by the Convocation of 1571, the original Subscription of which by the lower House of that Convocation, they have now in the Bodleian Library at Oxford, amongst Mr. Selden's Books, who had it immediately out of that Arch-bishop's Library; and the Arch-bishop might not improperly call this an Original, as Bishop Barlow does, both in his *Remains*;

and in some MS. Observations concerning the Articles, and especially the 20th, which are preserv'd among his Books in the publick Library at Oxford, and that for the Reason alledg'd in the Letter from Oxford of the learned Gentleman above mention'd, who has been so obliging to send up a Transcript of these MS. Observations, of which we shall speak more hereafter, that Reason is, That the Articles of 1562 being nothing alter'd in the Convocations of 1571, but only read, and confirm'd, and subscrib'd again, and all this upon a printed Copy, which was the properest, since the Articles were not alter'd, that Copy was henceforth as much an Original, as the Subscription thereto annex'd, by Reason of this new Sanction made upon it. Now this Original of the Articles relating only to the Convocation of 1571, cannot be brought in Competition with Archbishop Parker's MS. of 1562; nor therefore can its Authority, tho' attest- ed by the Subscription of only one House of Convocation, be overthrown by that, altho' subscrib'd by both Houses; but if any Record that pretends to be an Original be oppos'd against it, it must be that of Archbishop Parker, in the same Year 1571, of which I shall speak presently; and that must be of less Authority according to our Author's own Argument; for it contains the Subscriptions only of Archbishop Parker and Ten Bishops, which do not amount so much as to one entire House of Convocation, whereas this Oxford Original is subscrib'd by above a Hundred of the lower House, which as the learned Gentleman,

wlo.

Which yet might not im- properly be cal- led an Original.

But cannot be brought in Com- petition with the MS. of 1562.

And that of 1571. must yield to it by this very Ar- gument.

who sent up a Copy of these Subscriptions, observes, might give just occasion to the Arch-Bishop to say^a, that it was subscrib'd by all the lower House.

His last Argument against the Record is taken from a double Subscription of the Articles.

The Ground of it will be shew'd to be false when we come to the MS. of 1562.

His last Argument against the original Record of the Articles, appeal'd to by Arch-bishop Laud, is taken from what he calls a double Subscription of the Articles, first by some Members of the lower House, and afterwards by the Body of that House upon the 5th of February. And thence he argues, that if both those Subscriptions were made to numerically the same Articles, then the Record Arch-bishop Laud appeals to was forg'd, because not the same with Arch-bishop Parker's MS. of 1562, which he concludes to be the very Record sign'd on that 5th of February, from the Postscript of the Latin Edition of the Articles publish'd Anno. 1563. But I shall presently shew, that that MS. was not the original Record of the Convocation of 1562; and that, among other Arguments, from that very Postscript, which he appeals to in this Case, and therefore I need not trouble my self with his wise Supposition of this double Subscription having been made to two different Copies of the Articles; and with the noble Inference he makes from thence: since it is certain, and appears even from the Authority, which he cites^a for this double Subscription, that it was made to the very same Articles.

^a Speech in the Star-Chamber. p. 83.

^b Priestcraft p. 43.

^c Ibid. p. 43.

This original Record therefore of the Articles of the Convocation of the Year 1562, to which Arch-bishop *Laud* appeal'd for the Authority of the controverted Clause, being thus vindicated against all the Exceptions of our *Adversary*, and consequently the Copy of the 20th Article transcrib'd from thence with that Clause in it, under the Hand of a Publick Notary, continuing an unexceptionable Evidence of the Authority of that Clause: It remains, that the Arch-bishop's Defence of himself, and of the Clause against the Charge of Forgery, is full, and clear, and unanswerable; and that on the contrary, all the Fraud with regard to the 20th Article, has been committed by the Faction, in rasing out and expunging the disputed Clause.

The Record appeal'd to by Arch-bishop Laud, being thus vindicated, all the Fraud with respect to the Clause, lies at the Door of our Adversaries.

And now it is time to go on with the Arch-bishop's Speech in the Star-Chamber, to give some Account of this vile Practice. And thus the great Prelate continues ^{As is shewn in the Remainder of the Arch-bishop's Defence.} *Why but then, My Lords, what is this Mystery of Iniquity? Truly, I cannot certainly tell; but as far as I can, I'll tell you. And he proceeds to do it in these words. The Articles, you see, were fully and fairly agreed to and subscrib'd in the Year 1562; but after this, in the Year 1571, the Articles were printed both in Latin and English, and this Clause of the Church left out of both. And certainly this could not be done, but by the malicious Cunning of the opposite Faction. And so I shall spare dead Men's Names, where*

² Remains, Vol. 2. p. 83.

I have not Certainty, yet if you be pleas'd to look back, and consider who they were, that govern'd Business in 1571, and rid the Church almost at their Pleasure; and how Potent the Ancestors of these Libellers began then to grow, you will think it no hard Matter, to have the Articles printed, and this Clause left out.

And yet, continues the Arch-bishop, 'tis plain, that after the stir about Subscription in the Year 1571, the Articles were settled and subscrib'd unto at last, as in the Year 1562, with this Clause in them for the Church: For looking farther into the Records, which are in my own Hands, I have found the Book of 1563, subscrib'd by all the lower House of Convocation in this very Year of Contradiction 1571, Dr. John Elmar (who was after Lord Bishop of London) being there Prolocutor: Alexander Nowel, Dean of St. Paul's, having been Prolocutor in 1562, and yet living, and present, and subscribing in 1571. Therefore, concludes the Arch-bishop, I do here openly in the Star-Chamber charge upon that pure Sect this foul Corruption of falsifying the Articles of the Church of England: Let them take it off as they can.

And their neither invalidating his Proofs, nor clearing themselves all this time, is an Argument against them.

Thus far Arch-bishop Laud: And as far as a negative Argument can prove, it must be own'd a very good Evidence, as well of his and all the Clergy's Innocence in this Matter, as of the Guilt of the Faction, that they were not then, and have not been able in all this time, either to invalidate his Proofs, or to shew their own Innocence; as I shall have occasion to observe more particularly hereafter.

But

But what neither the Malice nor the Corruption of those worst of Times could produce, that our modern *Libeller* finds without Difficulty; and has been as diligent in collecting Exceptions against this Part of the Arch-bishop's Defence, as against the other; and I shall soon shew, that they are as much without ground.

His first Exception is against the Account the Arch-bishop gives of those spurious Editions of the Articles without the controverted Clause, in the Year 1571, viz. That they were most probably owing to the malicious Cunning of the Faction, and to the Power of those, that govern'd Businesses, and rid the Church at that time. This our Author calls ^a most choice Remark, pretending that both the Parliament, and Convocation of 1571 pass'd the Articles without the controverted Clause; and therefore that none but the Governours of the Church rid it at that time; and that they had as much Right to leave out the Clause, as any other Governours could have to insert it. But I have already shewn, that the Articles to which the Parliament injoin'd Subscription, which our Author is pleas'd to call passing them, were those of the Convocation of 1562; and it appears from the original Subscription abovemention'd, of the Lower House of the Convocation of 1571, to a Latin Copy of the same Articles, printed in the Year 1563, and by the Ratification of the Articles in all the Copies of them printed

Our Author's first Exception against the Arch-Bishop's Account of this Fraud.

Has been answered already.

^a Priest-Craft, p. 19.

since the Year 1571, that they were the same Articles of the Convocation of 1562, which were read, and confirmed again by the Subscription of the Convocation of 1571. Now the Arch-bishop having prov'd by an authentick Copy from the original Record of the Convocation of 1562, that the Articles then pass'd, had the controverted Clause in them; it hence follows, that this Clause was also pass'd by the Convocation of 1571, and by the Parliament that Year, if injoyning Subscription to them can be call'd passing them; but I shall have occasion to shew this farther hereafter. And

Dr. Fuller, from whom he borrows this Exception, could have set him right as to those that govern'd Busineses, &c. at that time, as he knew, Dr. Heylin had observ'd.

now is not this Gentleman's as choice a Remark, concerning those that rid the Church at that time? Dr. Fuller, whom he quotes^b a little above, and who likely in that very Page^c gave him the first hint of this Objection, might (as Dr. Heylin very well observes^d) have easily help'd him through the Difficulty, and told him who they were that govern'd Busineses, and rid the Church at that time, as much Ignorance as he himself affects in this matter. Strange, says Heylin^e, that a Man who undertakes to write an History, should profess himself ignorant of the Names of those, who govern'd the Busines of the Times he writes of. But this is only an affected Ignorance, profess'd on purpose to preserve the Honour of some Men, whom he (Fuller) beholds, as the chief Patrons of the Puritan Faction: For afterwards

^b Priest-Craft. p. 14. ^c Church Hist. Cent. 16. p. 74.

^d Exam. Hist. P. 1. p. 145. ^e Id. ibid.

(this

(this turn being serv'd) he can find out who they were, that then govern'd Businesse, and rid the Church almost at their Pleasure; telling us, fol. 128, that the Earl of Leicester interpos'd himself Patron General to the Non-Subscribers, and that he did it at the Perswasion of Roger Lord North. Besides which two, says he, we find¹ Sir Francis Knollys to be one of those, who gave Countenance to the Troubles at Frankford, at such time as the Faction was there hottest against the Liturgy, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church of England. Who being a near Kinsman of the Queen's, and a Privy Counsellor, made use of all Advantages to pursue that Project, which being set on foot beyond Sea, had been driven on here; and tho' Leicester was enough of himself to ride the Church at his Pleasure, yet being fitted with such Helps, Sir Francis Walsingham, and many more of the same kind, which the Times then gave him, they drove on the faster, till he had almost plung'd all in remediless Ruine. Thus far Dr. Haylin in answer to this Objection of Fuller; and I was the more willing to set down the whole Passage, not only in answer to the same Objection here reviv'd by our Author, tho' not in the same words; but also in proof of his great Ingenuity, to repeat an Objection which he knew had been answer'd, and take no notice of the Answer; tho' to shew he had read it, he quotes² the very next words to it; but this is the constant Method of his Party. He

And that in the very next Words before what he quotes from him.

¹ Lib. 8. fol. 35. ² Priest-Craft. p. 15.

since the Year 1571, that they were the same Articles of the Convocation of 1562, which were read, and confirmed again by the Subscription of the Convocation of 1571. Now the Arch-bishop having prov'd by an authentick Copy from the original Record of the Convocation of 1562, that the Articles then pass'd, had the controverted Clause in them, it hence follows, that this Clause was also pass'd by the Convocation of 1571, and by the Parliament that Year if injoyning Subscription to them can be call'd passing them; but I shall have occasion to shew this farther hereafter. And

Dr. Fuller, from whom he borrows this Exception, could have set him right as to those that govern'd Busineses, &c. at that time, as he knew, Dr. Heylin had observed.

now is not this Gentleman's as choice a Remark, concerning those that rid the Church at that time? Dr. Fuller, whom he quotes a little above, and who likely in that very Page^c gave him the first hint of this Objection, might (as Dr. Heylin very well observes^d) have easily help'd him through the Difficulty, and told him who they were that govern'd Busineses, and rid the Church at that time, as much Ignorance as he himself affects in this matter. Strange, says Heylin^e, that a Man who undertakes to write an History, should profess himself ignorant of the Names of those, who govern'd the Busines of the Times he writes of. But this is only an affected Ignorance, profess'd on purpose to preserve the Honour of some Men whom he (Fuller) beholds, as the chief Patrons of the Puritan Faction: For afterwards

^b Priest-Craft. p. 14. ^c Church Hist. Cent. 16. p. 7

^d Exam. Hist. P. 1. p. 145. ^e Id. ibid.

(this turn being serv'd) he can find out who they were, that then govern'd Businesses, and rid the Church almost at their Pleasure; telling us, fol. 128, that the Earl of Leicester interpos'd himself Patron General to the Non-Subscribers, and that he did it at the Perswasion of Roger Lord-North. Besides which two, says he, we find^t Sir Francis Knollys to be one of those, who gave Countenance to the Troubles at Frankford, at such time as the Faction was there hottest against the Liturgy, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church of England. Who being a near Kinsman of the Queen's, and a Privy Counsellor, made use of all Advantages to pursue that Project, which being set on foot beyond Sea, had been driven on here; and tho' Leicester was enough of himself to ride the Church at his Pleasure, yet being fitted with such Helps, Sir Francis Walsingham, and many more of the same kind, which the Times then gave him, they drove on the faster, till he had almost plung'd all in remediless Ruine. Thus says Dr. Haylin in answer to this Objection of Fuller, and I was the more willing to set down the whole Passage, not only in answer to the same Objection here reviv'd by our Author, tho' not in the same words; but also in proof of his great Ingenuity, to repeat an Objection which he knew had been answer'd, and take no notice of the Answer; tho' to shew he had read it, he quotes^e the very next words to it; but this is the constant Method of his Party. He

And that in the very next Words before what he quotes from him.

^t Lib. 8. fol. 35. ^e Priest-Craft. p. 15.

And so could
another Author,
in the very
Page, where
this Gentleman
also borrows
from him.

His next Ex-
ception is to the
Arch-bishop's
Proof, that the
Clause was
pass'd again in
the Convocation
of 1571.

does the very same with another Author^a
from whom he borrows Arguments against
the Authority of the controverted Clause,
and yet will not be inform'd by him in the
same Page, that it was not the *Governours* of
the Church, but the Earl of Leicester, a
great Favourer of Non-Conformists, and a
Favourite of the Queen's, whom the Arch-
bishop understood to have rid the Church
at that time.

His next Exception is to that Evidence
which the Arch-bishop brings of the Arti-
cles with the controverted Clause in them
having been pass'd again in the Convoca-
tion of 1571; and here to discover, as he has
the Assurance to word it^b, *what sort of Evi-*
vidence Arch-bishop Laud was, he undertakes
to shew from the Arch-bishop's own words
in direct Contradiction to what he says in
his Speech, *that he never saw any Articles*
that were settled and subscrib'd in 1571; and
the Passage he produces to prove this, is out
of the Arch-bishop's *History of his own Trou-*
bles and Tryal^c, the very same from whence
(as we have seen above) he in vain at-
tempts to prove a like Contradiction upon
the Arch-bishop, with respect to the origi-
nal Articles of the Convocation of 1562;
and we shall soon see, that his Attempt here
is equally vain and fruitless. To the Com-
mittee of the House of Commons, then
sent to me, says the Arch-bishop, for an
Account under my Hand, *what Originals*

^a Hamilton. *Some Necess. of Reform.* p. 14, 15.

^b *Priest-Craft.* p. 36. ^c *Hist. of Troub. &c.* p. 208.

had of the Articles of Religion establish'd
 1562, and 1571, I return'd this Answer in
 writing, with my Name to it. The original
 Articles of 1571 I could never find in my Pa-
 per Study at Lambeth, or any where else:
 And whether any Copy of them were ever
 left there, I cannot tell, &c. This our Li-
 beller has the Insolence to call, the Arch-
 bishop's contradicting himself, and destroying
 his own Testimony in the Star-Chamber, in the
 fullest manner that can be. But where is
 the Contradiction? In his Speech he says,
 That among the Records in his own Hands,
 he found the Book of 1562, subscrib'd by all
 the lower House of Convocation in the Year
 1571, which very Book, as I have observ'd,
 is still extant. And in his Answer to the
 Committee, he says, That the original Ar-
 ticles of 1571 he could never find in his Pa-
 per Study at Lambeth, or any where else;
 and whether any Copy of them were ever left
 there, he could not tell. Is it not evident,
 that in these two Passages the Arch-bishop
 speaks of two different things? In the first,
 of a printed Copy of the Articles of 1562,
 sign'd in 1571; and in the latter, of the
 original Articles of 1571? And tho' that
 Book may not improperly be call'd also
 an Original, as was observ'd above, because
 of the original Subscription of one House of
 Convocation annex'd to it; yet 'tis certain
 the Committee did not mean any printed
 Copy, but the original MS. of that Convo-
 cation, if there were any such thing; and

The Arch-bishop
 again falsely ac-
 cused of contra-
 dicting himself.

*The Libeller's
disingenuity in
this Citation,
is of a piece
with his u-
sage of my Lord
Bacon in his
Title Page.*

*The falshood is
his, not the
Arch-bishop's.*

that not sign'd, like this Book, only by one House, but by both; and the Arch-bishop's Answer might have been thought insincere if it had not been according to their meaning. Our Discoverer of *Priestcraft* seems to have been aware of this, and therefore in order to impose upon his Reader, when he comes to shew the pretended Contradiction, he artfully leaves the Word *Book* out of the Passage before cited in the Bishop's Speech: And this with the same ingenuity that in the very Front of his Libel he has falsify'd my Lord *Bacon's* Testimony, and made him speak as much like an Atheist as himself, by giving us only one part of what he says, and making a general Application of it; whereas his Lordship applies it only to a particular Subject; to those Wonders and Prodigies, of which he is speaking, such as those related by *Livy* and others; of which it is as true, that those which have any dependence upon Religion are to be the most suspected; as that Assertion is most false and impious in the Sense, to which our *Accuser* perverts it. And now what is it, *the Blessed Martyr*, as he is stil'd in ridicule by the Author of *Priest-Craft* and his Party, those *Children of them which kill the Prophets*; or this *Accuser of the Brethren* who *having no fear of being call'd to an Account for what he says, has made no scruple to put a falshood upon the World?* As to his Opinion of our *Blessed Martyr*, after this, the greatest Complement he can make him

to insinuate, that he and his Friends have a very ill Opinion of him; and it would be doing him and them too much Honour, to say upon this Occasion, how very ill an Opinion all good Men have of them: And this *notorious prevarication*, which he has the Forehead to charge upon Arch-bishop *Laud*, but all the World must see is purely his own, will be so far from altering the Opinion of the World, concerning either that excellent Prelate, or this most malicious Calumniator, that it will help to confirm them in their Judgment, that Arch-bishop *Laud* was one of the greatest Men, and of the best Friends, both to the Church and Constitution, that stand recorded in our History; and that this pernicious *Scribler* is one of the greatest Enemies to both.

Their different Characters.

Thus having, I hope, fully clear'd from all Imputation of Forgery, with respect to the controverted Clause of the 20th Article, not only Arch-bishop *Laud* and the Prelates of his time, but all the Clergy in general; and retorted this invidious Charge upon the *accusers*, by pleading in vindication of the Prelates and our selves, that Arch-bishop's Defence against *Burton*, and those other Antecessors of our Modern *Libellers*, and by supporting that Defence against all the Objections of our new *Discoverer* of Frauds; I shall now consider those farther Grounds, upon which this Charge of Forgery is renewed against the Clergy at present; and these are taken, partly from Two Original MSS. of the Articles in the Library of *Christi College* in Cambridge, and partly from

The farther Grounds upon which the same Charge of Forgery is now renewed against all the Clergy.

from some Testimonies alledged by this Gentleman to prove, that the controverted Clause *was not contain'd in the Book of Articles ratify'd, as his Phrase is, by Parliament.*

This is the positive Evidence which our Author produces against the Authority of the controverted Clause, and consequently for the pretended *Forgery of inserting and continuing it in the 20th Article of Religion*; with this he makes his first attack upon the Clause; and to prepare the way for it, observes *"that the Articles of our Church were agreed to, and subscrib'd by the Convocation of 1562; and afterwards review'd by that of 1571; and ratify'd, say he, by Parliament in the beginning of the Year.* He might have observ'd, that most of these Articles had been first pass'd in the Convocation of 1552; for the Articles of *Edward VI* were at least the ground work of these of *Queen Elizabeth*. However upon his own Account, I am ready to join issue with him, and to accept of his Appeal to the Records of those Two Convocations, and to the Book of Articles referred to by Parliament in their pretended Confirmation of them, for the Authority of the Clause in question; having, I hope, already prov'd from both, that it is of most undoubted Authority. And now let us see what he advances to the contrary.

The two MSS. of Corpus Christi College in Cambridge.

There are Two Original MSS. of the Articles, says he, pass'd in those Two Convocations, now in *Corpus Christi College*

" Priest-Craft p. 11. • Ibid. p. 12. 13.

library among Arch-bishop Parker's MSS. who was President of both those Convocations, and left these MSS. among his other Papers to that College at his Death. These are both subscrib'd by their respective Convocations, the first Anno 1562, by both Houses of the Province of Canterbury, and by some Bishops of that of York; the latter Anno 1571, only by the Arch-bishop of Canterbury, and Ten Bishops of that Province: and both appear to be Originals by the Hands of the Subscribers, which are well known. Now that the controverted Clause is contain'd in neither of these MSS. the Reader, says he, may satisfy himself from my Lord of Sarum's Exposition only, where Three of the Fellows of that College testify^p, that it is not in the MS. of 1562, and Dr. Green the present Master certifies^q the Bishop, that it is wanting in that of 1571. But where does the Master certify this? Our Author directs us to that Collation of the Printed Editions with this MS, which the Bishop says^r Dr. Green procur'd him, and which as it is minute and particular almost to a Fault, so the Bishop gives it us at its full Length, and yet after all that exactness, if this Gentleman please to consult that Collation once more, he will find that, whatever Account Dr. Green may have sent of this MS. to the Bishop of Salisbury, yet this Collation of it, as published in his Name by the Bishop, is so far from certifying his Lordship,

The Collation cited to prove that the MS. of 1571 wants the Clause, certifies the contrary, not improbably by the fault of the Printer.

^p Expos. on the Art. Introd. p. 10. ^q Ibid. p. 13. ^r Ibid. p. 12.

that the controverted Clause *is wanting in this MS.* that it evidently certifies the contrary. I confess that may not improbably be owing to the Mistake of the Printer, putting MS. instead of Pr. and giving us the Clause in a White, instead of a Black Letter, which tho' it excuses Dr. Green, yet leaves both the Bishop and our Author without excuse; the Bishop for taking no notice of this Mistake, and our Author, for appealing to this Collation for what it apparently contradicts; as appears at first Sight; for the Method of the Collation is this: having noted that MS. stands for Manuscript, and Pr. for Print, the Dr. proceeds to give us the various Readings of every Article in different Characters, after this manner, viz.

Art. 1. MS. And True God, and he is Everlasting, without Body.

Pr. And True God, Everlasting, without Body.

and so of all the rest in order, and this Collation of the 20th Article stands thus.

Art. 20. MS. The Church hath Power to decree Rites and Ceremonies, and Authority in Controversies of Faith, and yet.

These Words are not in the Original MS.

So that according to this Collation, as certainly as the reading abovementioned of the first Article, and that of every Article besides, to which MS. is prefix'd, is contain'd in the Manuscript; so certainly is the controverted Clause contain'd in the 20th Article of it; because

because MS. is here prefix'd to that Clause; and what is added in a Line underneath, in a different Character, that *these words are not in the Original MS.* can therefore only mean, that they are not in that other MS. of the Convocation of 1562, wherein these Articles were first pass'd, and which may therefore, to distinguish it from this of 1571, be call'd *the Original MS.*

I have been the more particular in the Account of this Collation, because it will hardly be believ'd, that this Gentleman could have, I don't say so much Confidence, but so little Sense, as to refer us to an Author for the proof of a Fact, which that Author does most expressly deny; and yet it is so evident, that he does this, when he appeals to Dr. Green's Collation of the *Corpus Christi* College MS. of 1571 (as it is published by Bishop Burnet) and to that *only*, to prove that the disputed Clause is not in that MS, that it is not possible to read over that Collation with the least Care, and not perceive this; and therefore it is the more surprizing, that the Bishop, for whose Information this Collation was made, and who publishes it to the World, should take no notice of this Mistake of the Printer, if it were his, and yet tell us in the next Page, ' that the Clause in question *was left out both in the Manuscripts, and in the Printed Editions of 1571.* But it is not the Bishop, but Dr. Green's Collation, to which

^c *Introd. p. 16.*

For this MS.
as well as that
of 1562, does
certainly want
the contested
Clause.

our *Libeller* refers us for Satisfaction in this point, and to that *only*; and therefore if we are to be judg'd by that *only*, the controverted Clause must be concluded to be in this MS. of 1571, and our Author to have produc'd this Argument directly against himself.

And this might be a sufficient Answer to this Detector of Forgery, as to the *Corpus Christi* College MS. of 1571, and indeed utterly overthrow his whole Book: But I was willing to do right to the Argument, as well as to him; and therefore tho' I had formerly examin'd this Matter my self in *Corpus Christi* Library, yet because it was some Years since, and the Minutes I then took, were but very short, I gave a Learned Friend at *Cambridge* the trouble to examine it all over again now, (notwithstanding that Account of the MS. of 1571, which the Bishop of *Sarum* gives us, as Dr. *Green's*, and to my great surprize, that my Friend sends me word, together with many other very useful Remarks, that the disputed Clause is wanting in that MS, as well as in that of 1562; so that our Discoverer has in this Matter happen'd to blunder upon the truth, at the same time, that he was either so malicious, as to design to falsify it, or so blind, that he could not see he was actually falsifying it: as tho' it had been a Judgment upon him, that while he is unjustly charging others of Falshood, he shou'd be so remarkably guilty of it himself, as not to be able even to speak the truth without lying.

And our Author
has happened to
speak truth,
when he seems
to have least
design'd it.

But in answer to the Argument against the Authority of the controverted Clause, drawn from these two pretended Originals of the Articles, subscrib'd by the Convocations of 1562, and of 1571, in both which that Clause is undoubtedly wanting; I do utterly deny, that these two MSS. of *Corpus Christi* College are the Authentick Records of the Articles pass'd in those two Convocations, or are of any Authority in the Case before us: and this I shall endeavour to make good, first in general of both MSS. together, and then in particular of each of them singly. With regard therefore to both these MSS, I observe,

1st, Whereas Records are generally ingross'd on Parchment, in black large Characters, these two MSS. are on Paper, neither of them ingross'd, and the latter in a pale small Hand, not very correctly written.

These MSS. are not the Original Records of the Convocations to which they relate.

2dly, They have neither of them the Royal Authority without which, by the Act of Submission as the Convocation could not meet, so their Acts are of no validity. *The Clergy can order and settle nothing in Convocation, as we are told in the King's Declaration before the Articles, without first obtaining leave under the Broad Seal so to do, and the King's approving their said Ordinances and Constitutions.* Now the Records of all such Acts being the last conclusive Instruments, which are executed in passing them, and the executing of these

They are neither ingross'd, nor on Parchment, like Records.

They have neither of them the Royal Authority, by which the Articles must have been, and actually were confirmed, and that upon the Record.

Instruments, whether by Voting or Subscription, being the final agreement of the Convocation upon all such Acts, the Royal Approbation, which is thus necessary to make them valid, and which supposes the Act approv'd of, to be finally pass'd, must therefore of necessity be given to these Records by affixing the Broad Seal to them, as is usual in the Case of all Instruments ratify'd by the Royal Authority. This shews both that these Articles must have been assented to by the Queen, as well as pass'd by the Convocation, and that her Majesty's assent must have been given to the Original Record of the Articles: and accordingly we find in the Ratification, printed at the end of all the Copies of the Articles since 1571 inclusively, that they were approv'd and allow'd by the assent and consent of Queen Elizabeth; ratified by her says "my Lord Chief Justice Coke, under the great Seal of England; and it is yet more particularly express'd in the first Edition of the Articles, after the Postscript above-mentioned, in these words, *Quibus omnibus Articulis Serenissima Princeps Elizabetha — per seipsam diligenter prius lectis & examinatis, regium suum assensum præbuit* and that Postscript being a Copy of the Certificate of the Register, subjoin'd to the Original Record of the Articles, it is therefore certain, that the Royal assent was actually given to that Record, and consequently, that these MSS. which want that

Instit P. 4. cap. 74. ult. No Necess. of Ref. ubi sup. p. 160
Ratification

Ratification, were only preparatory to the Record, by which the Articles were finally agreed to and confirm'd, but neither of them any such Record themselves.

3dly, These Records were laid up at St. Paul's in the Arch-bishop's Registry, and the Arch-bishop had no more personal Propriety in them, than in the Records of any other of his Offices; or indeed than in the very Offices themselves: nor therefore could Arch-bishop Parker have given these MSS. to the College, where they now are with the rest of his Papers, had they been any such Records: Nor could the College have right to them by vertue of his Gift. All Papers indeed that were preparatory to the last Act of Convocation, whereby these Articles, or any other Business was pass'd, did belong to the Arch-bishop, as President of the Convocation which pass'd them, and even a preparatory Subscription of both Houses of Convocation, to Articles or Canons hereby agreed upon, being no more than Warrant for the making up such agreement into a Record, and of Authority no longer, than till that is done, may be afterwards lodg'd in the Hands of the President of the Convocation; for when these Articles of 1602 were subscrib'd by both Houses of the Convocation of 1604, the Book so subscrib'd was kept by the Bishop of London President, as appears from the Extracts out of the Upper House Journals: and the very next Paper to these MSS. of Arch-bi-

They were both given to Bennet College as a Legacy by Arch-bishop Parker, which Records could not have been, no single Person having any separate Propriety in them.

Tho' the Arch-bishop had a propriety in all the preparatory Papers of the Convocations, of which he was President.

shop *Parker* in one of the Volumes, entitled *Synodalia*, in *Benner* College Library is a like preparatory Subscription of the Canons of the Convocation of 1571: nor is it unlikely that the *Autographum* in Archbishop *Parker's* Hands, referr'd to in the Certificate of the Register, printed at the end of *Wolfe's* Edition of the Articles, might be such a preparatory Subscription of the Record especially if the Record it self were subscrib'd, but only attested by the Person who drew up the Proceedings of that Convocation into Acts, and ratify'd by the Queen. But as that *Autographum* it self (which if not the very Record subscribed of 1562, subscrib'd again after the necessary Alterations made in it) was of Authority only till the Record was made, and the Articles finally agreed to by it, and therefore it was a Matter of no great Importance in whose Hands it was lodg'd, after the Record was made. So the Record, which was to remain as Authentick Evidence to all Posterity of the Articles thereby pass'd and confirm'd, was no sooner executed, but it became a publick Instrument, no more at the disposal of the Archbishop of *Canterbury*, either as President of the Convocation in which the Articles were pass'd, or as Master of the Office in which the Record was kept, but the Records of Parliament are the Property, either of the Keeper of the Records at the *Tower of London*, or of the Master of the Rolls. All such publick Instruments are the Property, not of any particular Person.

Person, but of the whole Community, to which they relate, whether Ecclesiastical or Civil; every Soul in the Kingdom has an interest in them, and for that reason they are kept, not in private Hands, but in a publick Office, out of which Sir Simon Ewes observes, that they cannot so much be removed, I suppose he means, on any extraordinary occasions; and that may have been one reason, why Arch-bishop Laud did not produce the Record it self in the Star-Chamber, but contented himself with an Authentick Copy from it. From all which it is evident, that these MSS. of *Corporation Christi College*, left to it as a Legacy by Arch-bishop Parker, together with the rest of his Papers, however they were preparatory to the Articles pass'd in the Convocation of 1562, and review'd and subscrib'd again in that of 1571, could not be the Authentick Records of the Articles of either those Convocations.

But besides these general Arguments against the Authority of both these MSS. together, there are others equally conclusive against that of each of them in particular. To consider them in their order; first with relation to that of 1562, I observe, 1st, That this MS. (if we believe our Author's own Account of it from Mr. *Wright*, the very Account from whence I would argue it to be the Original Record of the Articles pass'd by that Convocation) is only a fair Draught of King Ed-

All publick Instruments are the propriety of the Community to which they relate.

The MS. of
1562, according
to this Gentle-
man's own Ac-
count of it, is
only a foul pre-
paratory
draught of the
Articles.

ward's Articles, accurately writ out for the
and serious Consideration of the Arch-bishop
and by him scratch'd and altered with a R
Lead Pen, which, says Mr. Strype, the Arch-
shop commonly us'd for noting, as he read a
Book. These Strokes, says he, are drawn in
ny Places, sometimes thro' Words, and sometimes
thro' whole Lines, and some of the Artic
wholly superseded by the Arch-bishop's Miming
and divers others of them shorned; dashed
that thro', which he was minded to have
mitted. He gives several Instances of the
and of a Word or Two here and there
terlin'd with the Arch-bishop's Hand, a
which is very remarkable, of one Eng
Correction, tho' the Articles be *Latin*, A
is it not evident from this Account, that
this MS. is at best only a foul Draught
of the Original Articles, that upon which
most of the last Emendations were con-
ded, which were judged proper to be made
in the Convocation of 1562, upon the Ar-
ticles of *Edward VI*! Was a draught so
scratch'd and alter'd, fit to remain a public
Record, of what a Convocation had agreed
upon, in Matters of so much importance
as the Articles of our Religion? And would
they make their Corrections upon a
draught, and pass the Articles upon a
one? Or indeed did they ever pass the
according to all these Corrections? Where
Copy of these Articles is there, either printed
ed or written, in which the old Title of
the 16th Article, *De Peccato in Spiritu*
Sanctum, stands as now corrected in this MS.
De Peccato after Baptism? But this MS.

as it is, is subscrib'd by both Houses of that Convocation, and the Subscriptions known to be their own hands; and this may be thought a better Argument, that this was the Original Subscription of that Convocation, which was to remain as an Authentick Record of the Articles then agreed upon, than any Strokes of *Minium*, or Alterations made in this MS. can be to the contrary. I observe therefore from the same Author,

That as full as this Subscription of both Houses is, yet there want two of the Upper House, the Bishops of *Rochester* and *Exeter*, whom this Author finds to have both subscrib'd, from certain *Extracts* out of the *Registers*, in which their Names are inserted among the rest: and if they did subscribe, and there was any Authentick Record of the Articles sign'd, it is certain they subscrib'd that Record; and that therefore this MS, which wants their Names, as it is not the full and intire Subscription of that Convocation; so consequently neither is it the Original Record of the Articles, then sign'd and agreed to. And yet I observe farther.

That the abovemention'd strokes and alterations made in this MS. by Archbishop *Parker*, must have been made either before or after the Subscription. If they were made after it, then it is a Subscription, not to the 39 Articles now in force, but to a different set of Articles, consisting

All the Subscribers Names are not to it.

If the Alterations in it were posterior to the Subscription, it has no relation to the 39 Articles; if prior, there must have been some memorandum of them also subscrib'd.

of 42, which we are not concern'd with, and are of no more Authority in the C before us, than the Articles of the Peace *Ryswick*: But if these Alterations were made before the Subscription, and that (as must be understood) with an intent, that the Subscription should be made to the Articles, not as they stood in this MS. before these Strokes and Alterations were made, but as they were thus alter'd; there must have been some *Memorandum* of these Alterations also made and witness'd at the same time, as is usual in the Subscription of all Instruments, in Case of least interlineation; it being otherwise impossible to know from the Instrument itself, whether such Alterations were previous or posterior to the Subscription: and if a *Memorandum* was the more necessary in this Case; because these Strokes of *Minium* are so finely drawn, as not to deface the Original, even where they seem most to have design'd it; so that it might otherwise be a Question, whether these fine Strokes were not drawn, at least in many places, not to expunge the Passages so mark'd, rather to recommend them to the Reader's more particular Consideration, as is usual in transcribing Citations, or any thing more remarkable than ordinary: Now though the Number of the Articles and Lines in each Page, of this MS. sum'd up at the end of it, be also alter'd with regard to those Pages, in which the great Alterations are made; and according to the Number of Lines struck out, viz.

And that, both to signify, that the Strokes of Minium made in it were design'd for Alterations, and that they were made previous to the Subscription.

ii quatuor chang'd for *quatuordecim* in one of those Sums, and so of most of the rest, which answers one end of such a *Memorandum*, and shews that these red Lines were made to expunge the Passages mark'd with them; yet as it does not fully answer this end, because all the Lines thus scor'd are not discounted at the close of the MS: So there is nothing to satisfy the other, which is the chief end of such a *Memorandum*, viz. to shew, that these Alterations in the Body of the MS. and those in the Form of Subscription at the end of it, which specifies most of those in the Body, were either of them made Antecedent to the Subscription. Since therefore the only use of such an Original Record of the Articles, as we are enquiring after, is to attest to all Posterity, that such Articles as are therein contain'd, were agreed upon and subscrib'd to according to the date and tenour of that Record; and it is impossible to know by this pretended Original of the Articles now in force, whether it was a Subscription to our 39 Articles, or to a different sett consisting of 42, for want of some Authentick *Memorandum*, that should have been subscrib'd with it, to signify that the Alterations made therein, were all antecedent to the Subscription, and that the 42 Articles of the Original Draught were thereby first reduc'd to 39, and then sign'd by the Convocation: It hence follows, that this MS. of 1562 cannot be an Original Record of the 39 Articles now in Force. But to put this Matter beyond dispute, and prove from the

Testimony of this MS. it self, that it is only the Copy of an *Autographum*, and not the *Autographum* it self, I observe,

4thly, That the Form of the Subscription at the End of this MS. is, according to Mr. Scrype's Account of ^a it, conceiv'd in these Words, *Hos Articulos fidei Christianæ continentos in universum novendecim Paginas in Autographo, quod asservatur apud Reverendissimum in Christo Patrem Dom. Matthæum Cantuar. Archiepiscopum totius Angliæ Primatem & Metropolitatum. Et in primâ Pagina quatuor Articulos & Lineas triginta quatuor, &c.* (naming also how many Articles and Lines are contain'd in all the succeeding Pages) *Nos Archiepiscopi & Episcopi utriusque Provincia Regni Angliæ in sacra Synodo Provinciali legitime Congregati recipimus, & profitemur, & ut veros atque Orthodoxos manuum nostrarum subscriptionibus approbamus, 29^o Die Mensis Januarii Anno Domini secundum Computationem Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ 1562^{do}. & Illustrissima Princip. Elizabethæ D. G. Ang Fr. & Hib. Regina, Fide Defens. &c. Domina nostra Clementiss. Anno 5^o.* Which Form referring us to the *Autographum*, and directing us where to find it whether the *Autographum* were the Record it self, and were said to be kept by Archbishop Parker, because it was laid up in his Office, or (which is more probable) were another preparatory Subscription of the Ar

This Manuscript refers to the Autographum, and therefore is not the Autographum itself.

^a Annals p. 289.

ticles, copy'd from this foul one, with the
 necessary Emendations, this MS. could not
 be that *Autographum*, unless we will sup-
 pose, that it referr'd to it self: And yet if
 it did so, why was it not said *in hoc Au-*
toprapho, as well as *hōs Articulos*, and *quod as-*
servabitur or *asservandum est*, rather than
asservatur apud, &c? Nay what need was
 there of naming either the *Autographum*, or
 where it was kept? Since as long as it was
 kept there, it was impossible to see it with-
 out knowing both, tho' the MS. had men-
 tion'd neither, and without seeing it, all
 it mentions is insignificant. I know the
 Postscript of the first Edition of the Ar-
 ticles is express'd in the same Terms, and
 that Postscript is without question an au-
 thentick Certificate of the Register, copy'd
 in all probability from the Record it self:
 But then if that Record was subscrib'd, and
 was it self the *Autographum*, it is but reasona-
 ble to suppose this Certificate to have been
 copy'd from it with the necessary variati-
 ons; and as this is express'd in the third
 Person, *recipiant & profitentur*, &c. where
 that must have been, like this MS. in the
 First: So in *Autographo quod asservatur*, &c.
 tho' necessary in the Certificate, to direct
 to the *Autographum*, yet was of no use in
 the *Autographum* it self, and therefore may
 be supposed not to have been in it: But if
 the Record, from whence this Certificate
 was copyed, was not subscrib'd, and this
 Certificate was taken from it without any
 variation, then the *Autographum*, to which
 it

*An Objection
 from the Post-
 script of Wolfe's
 Edition answer-
 ed.*

*Tho' that be a
 Certificate
 transcribed
 from the Re-
 cord, yet the
 Record need not
 for that Rea-
 son have refer'd
 to it self.*

Testimony of this MS. it self, that it is only the Copy of an *Autographum*, and not the *Autographum* it self, I observe,

4thly, That the Form of the Subscription at the End of this MS. is, according to Mr. Strype's Account of ^a it, conceiv'd in these Words, *Hos Articulos fidei Christianæ continentēs in universum novendecim Paginas in Autographo, quod asservatur apud Reverendissimum in Christo Patrem Dom. Matthæum Cantuar. Archiepiscopum totius Angliæ Primatem & Metropolitānum. Et in primâ Paginâ, quatuor Articulos & Lineas triginta quatuor, &c.* (naming also how many Articles and Lines are contain'd in all the succeeding Pages) *Nos Archiepiscopi & Episcopi utriusque Provincia Regni Angliæ in sacra Synodo Provinciali legitime Congregari recipimus, & profitemur, & ut veros atque Orthodoxos manuumstrarum subscriptionibus approbamus, 29^o Die Mensis Januarii Anno Domini secundum Computationem Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ 1562^{do}. & Illustrissima Princip. Elizabethæ D. G. Ang. Fr. & Hib. Regina, Fidei Defens. &c. Domina nostra Clementiss. Anno. 5^o.* Which Form referring us to the *Autographum*, and directing us where to find it, whether the *Autographum* were the Record it self, and were said to be kept by Archbishop Parker, because it was laid up in his Office, or (which is more probable) were another preparatory Subscription of the Ar-

This Manuscript refers to the *Autographum*, and therefore is not the *Autographum* it self.

^a Annals p. 289.

ticles, copy'd from this foul one, with the necessary Emendations, this MS. could not be that *Autographum*, unless we will suppose, that it referr'd to it self: And yet if it did so, why was it not said *in hoc Autographo*, as well as *hoy Articulos*, and *quod asseruabitur* or *asservandum est*, rather than *asservatur apud*, &c? Nay what need was there of naming either the *Autographum*, or where it was kept? Since as long as it was kept there, it was impossible to see it without knowing both, tho' the MS. had mention'd neither, and without seeing it, all it mentions is insignificant. I know the

Postscript of the first Edition of the Articles is express'd in the same Terms, and that Postscript is without question an authentic Certificate of the Register, copy'd in all probability from the Record it self: An Objection from the Postscript of Wolfe's Edition answered.

But then if that Record was subscrib'd, and was it self the *Autographum*, it is but reasonable to suppose this Certificate to have been copy'd from it with the necessary variations;

and as this is express'd in the third Person, *recipiunt & profitentur*, &c. where that must have been, like this MS. in the First: So in *Autographo quod asseruatur*, &c. tho' necessary in the Certificate, to direct to the *Autographum*, yet was of no use in the *Autographum* it self, and therefore may be supposed not to have been in it: But if the Record, from whence this Certificate was copyed, was not subscrib'd, and this Certificate was taken from it without any variation, then the *Autographum*, to which it

Tho' that be a Certificate transcribed from the Record, yet the Record need not for that Reason have refer'd to it self.

it referr'd, was not the Record it self, but a Subscription preparatory to it; and it must be shewn that that Subscription also had these Words in *Autographo quod asseruatur*, &c. in the form of it, before any Argument can be drawn from thence, to countenance their Opinion, who suppose this MS. to be the very *Autographum*, which itself refers to. So that take it either way, the Postscript of Wolfe's Edition cannot justify this pretended Record's referring to it self: For if the Record was subscrib'd, from whence that Postscript was copy'd, 'tis not likely those Words in *Autographo quod asseruatur*, &c. were in it; and if it was not subscrib'd, then those Words in it referr'd to another Instrument, as my Argument supposes they do in this MS. And tho' those Words in the Certificate subjoin'd to the Record it self were no prejudice to the Authority of the Record, which if it was not the *Autographum* referr'd to, was yet an Instrument of more Authority than the *Autographum*, which in that Case must have been only a preparatory Subscription; yet the same Words in a Certificate subjoin'd to any Draught of the Articles subscrib'd, as this MS. is, must refer either to the Record subscrib'd, or to another preparatory Subscription, and shew that such draught is no more than a Copy of one of those Originals, and not the *Autographum* or Original itself.

And as there are all these Arguments in particular against the Authority of the MS. of 1562, besides those produc'd above a.

gainst that of both these MSS. in general; so we have likewise several Arguments, which particularly relate to the MS. of 1571, and prove that to be of no more Authority than the other. For,

1st, This MS. is so far from being an Authentick Record of the Articles review'd and subscrib'd again in the Convocation of 1571, that it is not even (what the other has some pretence to) an entire preparatory Subscription to them, no not so much as of one House; for tho' the Form of the Subscription, as Bishop Burnet gives^d it us, shews that it was intended to be subscribed by the Arch-bishops and Bishops of both Provinces, yet it is actually subscrib'd (as appears from the same Author^e) only by the Metropolitan and Ten Bishops of the Province of Canterbury. That there were more Bishops present in that Convocation, is evident, both from the Form of the Subscription now mention'd, conceiv'd in these Words, *We th' Arch-bishops and Bishops of either Province, &c.* and especially from the Canons of this very Convocation having been sign'd by the Arch-bishops and twenty Bishops of both Provinces, either in Person or by Proxy, as appears from an Original Subscription still extant among Arch-bishop Parker's MSS, the very next Paper in this Volume of *Synodalia*, to that imperfect Subscription of the Articles, of which we are now speaking. It is manifest therefore, that whatever hindered the

The MS. of 1571, is not an entire Subscription so much as of one house of Convocation.

^d *Expos. p. 15.* ^e *Id. Ibid.*

rest of the Bishops, and the Lower House of Convocation from subscribing this draught of the Articles, (of which I may have an Occasion to enquire hereafter) their Subscription was actually left unfinish'd; for which reason, tho' this MS. had been design'd for a Record, yet since it was not fully executed, it can be but an imperfect Record at the best, and consequently of no Authority.

It is a Subscription, as there express'd only to 38 Articles.

2dly, And as this Subscription is imperfect with respect to the Subscribers, so is it likewise with regard to the Articles subscribed to, if we take the Account of their Number from the Form of Subscription, for that expressly calls 'them XXXVIII Articles, tho' in all the Impressions from that very Year to this Day they have been constantly number'd XXXIX; and that in all probability from their being so number'd in this very Convocation: For the earliest Editions of the Articles with numbers to them, that yet appear either in English or in Latin, being those of this Year 1571, and they being all printed after the Articles had been review'd and subscribed again by this Convocation, as is plain from the express mention of that Subscription in the Ratification at the end of them: Is it at all probable, that the first Impressions of them after this would so differ from the Original Articles of that Convocation, as to put Numbers to them, if the Original had none; much less to number them

^f *Expos. Ibid.*

XXXIX, if that, whether by Mistake or otherwise, had call'd them only XXXVIII? and that all the Editions since, down to this time would have followed them in that variation from the Original? Is it not abundantly more likely, that those early and all these later Copies do herein agree with a true Original of that Convocation; and that this pretended Original, which has never been followed in this particular by any one Copy, whether genuine or spurious, by any of the Editions which want the contested Clause of the 20th Article, any more than of those which have it, is therefore no true Original either Record or even preparatory Subscription of the Articles of that Convocation, whatever it were at first design'd to be, but a Paper of no manner of Authority?

I own that the mistake of this MS, calling the Articles 38 instead of 39, is not in the Articles themselves, but only in the Numbers, which seem to be adapted to the Articles of *Edward 6th*, the 38th of which is the 39th of ours: but as such a Mistake could not have been made, without overlooking the Number of one of those Additional Articles, the insertion of which had disturbed the Order of the Numbers of King *Edward's*; so that oversight favours of too much neglect for a Record. It is true, some have thought the Ink, in which the Numbers are written, to appear something blacker than the rest; and have thence concluded the Numbers to be of later date, than the Subscription: But as that

Tho' the mistake be in the Numbers, and not in the Articles themselves.

that encreases the difficulty in another regard: For who would have presumed to add any thing to an Original Record? So it does not at all lessen it in this; for of whatever date the Numbers upon the Articles in this MS. are, that of XXXVIII in the Form of Subscription must be as antient as the Subscription it self; and tho' the misplacing of the other Numbers seems to have occasion'd the Error in this, yet it is from this last only, that I am now arguing against the Authority of the MS. of 1571, viz. from the very form of the Subscription to it, expressly calling the Articles 38, against the Testimony of all the Copies that have ever number'd them, which if any of them be true, even those that are of the greatest Credit with our Author, this MS. must certainly be of none at all, as most evidently false.

It seems to have some Additions to it of later date, not consistent with its being a Record.

3dly, As the Numbers of the Articles in this MS. by being adapted, as was observed, to those of *Edward VI*, may seem to have been added by another hand, for some different purpose; especially if any thing can be inferr'd from the seeming different blackness of the Ink; and that Addition to this MS. after the Subscription may shew, as was intimated above, that it could be no Authentick Record of the Articles, to which it was not lawful to add any thing, after it was once duly executed: So there is another seeming Addition to this MS, that may help strengthen this Argument, and that is, the Title of the *Homily against Rebellion*, which being written

in

in a hand yet smaller than the rest of the MS, is therefore thought to have been inserted afterwards. It might indeed be inserted after the MS. was first written, and yet before it was subscrib'd, if we suppose the MS. written before this Convocation; and if we suppose it written so long before, as to discover any difference in the blackness of the Ink, the Addition of the Numbers might be also antecedent to the Subscription; and it may be some Argument of both, that as all the Editions of the Articles of 1571 are number'd, so the *Homily against Rebellion* had been then made ever since the Year 1569: But if this MS, in which the Title of that *Homily* seems to have been at first omitted, was therefore written before that time, it could not be either at first intended for a Record of a Convocation that was not yet dream't of, or probably afterwards made use of to that purpose, any farther than as a Paper some way preparatory, tho' even as such it is evidently left unfinished.

4thly, The Articles having pass'd the Convocation of 1562. in Latin, and it being evident from the Ratification printed in all the Copies of them since the Year 1571, that they were the very Article of 1562, that were review'd, confirm'd, and subscrib'd again in this last Convocation; and it appearing farther from the above mention'd Original Subscription of the Lower House of this Convocation, tack'd to *Wolfe's* Edition of the Articles, that it was not an English but a Latin Copy, and that not a

The Articles sign'd by the upper House of this Convocation, was likely a printed Book, as that subscribed by the Lower; at least they were the Articles of 1562, which contain'd the Clause, that is wanting in this MS.

MS.

MS. but a printed Book, that was sign'd by that Lower House: As all this renders it highly probable, that the Upper House of the same Convocation subscrib'd the Articles also on a printed, if not likewise on a Latin Copy (besides that there could be no reason for a MS. Draught, since the Articles were printed, and were not to be alter'd) so it manifestly proves, that this MS. can be no Record of the Articles subscrib'd by the Convocation of 1571, if for no other, yet because the Articles contain'd in it are not the very Articles agreed upon by the Convocation of 1562, for want of the Affirmative Clause of the Church's Power, which has been shew'n above, from the very Original Records of that Convocation to have been contain'd in those Articles: so little Inference can be made against the Authority of that Clause, from its being wanting in this MS, that on the contrary it is a very good Argument, that this MS. is of no Authority, because that Clause is not in it.

The pretence of Arch-bishop Parker's Authority, in favour of these MSS. is groundless.

But our Adversary pretends * that Arch-bishop Parker's Authority gives the Cause on the side of these MSS. and on this Occasion he tells us what a *High Churchman* that Arch-bishop was; and therefore willing to do Justice to the Church; and as President of the only two Convocations, that ever had the Affair of our Articles before them, better qualify'd to give an Account of our Articles, than Arch-bishop Laud, or any succeeding Arch-

* Priestcraft p. 39.

bishop. And to what purpose is all this? Why does he institute a Comparison between those two Arch-bishops? Has Arch-bishop *Parker* interpos'd his Authority in favour of these MSS? or must they needs be the Original Records of the Articles pass'd in those two Convocations, because they were both his MSS, and have his Name among others subscrib'd to them? which would be as good a Reason to prove every Paper of his, that has his Name to it to be an Original Record of the Articles; and yet as ridiculous as that Reason is, I defie him to give a better to support this silly Argument: If indeed he could have given any at all, he would not have been so senseless to plead an Authority, and leave us at a loss where to find it. But whatever becomes of his Argument, he will always find his Account in setting our Arch-bishops against one another.

Having thus, I hope, made it appear, that neither of these MSS. of Arch-bishop *Parker* are the Original Articles of the Convocations they relate to, it follows evidently from hence, that their wanting the Controverted Clause of the Church's Power, is no Impeachment to the Authority of that Clause.

The only Difficulty that remains with respect to these two MSS. is to give some tolerable Account of them, how they came to be subscrib'd, one by both Houses of the Convocation of 1562. (two or three Bishops excepted) and the other by great part of the Upper House of the Convocation of 1571: and tho' this be not very easie to do, yet neither is it very necessary. It is enough,

The only Difficulty remaining is to give some Account of these MSS.

that I have shew'd, that neither of these MSS, are the Original Record of the Convocation they refer to, and that among other undeniable Proofs, by some of those Arguments, which our *Libeller* produces to prove, that they are those very Originals. And if they be not those Originals, then they can be of no Authority in the Question before us; then it is of no importance with relation to the contested Clause of the 20th Article, that it is not found in either of those MSS; and it may seem a matter of Curiosity, rather than use, to trouble our selves with any farther Enquiry about them.

Which may seem a Matter rather of Curiosity than Use.

Yet it is necessary for the Resolution of a Difficulty, that may help out a lame Argument of the Author's.

And yet because there is a Difficulty attends the Date of the Subscription of the MS. of 1562. which may help out a lame Argument us'd by our *Critick* above, in disproof of the Record appeal'd to by Archbishop *Laud*, and I have partly promis'd, to furnish him with that help; and because the Resolution of that Difficulty depends upon a farther Enquiry into this MS. I shall therefore, after I have mention'd what this Difficulty is, and shewn that it does not affect the main Question, endeavour to give a Resolution of it, by making that farther Enquiry.

What that Difficulty is.

Our Author's Argument against that Record was, that if it was subscrib'd before Archbishop *Parker's* MS, it could be of no Authority, being cancell'd by that subsequent Subscription: but he does not say,

why it could not have been subscrib'd after that, and yet there is a Difficulty on that side, no less obvious than on the other; for if that Record was subscrib'd after this MS. then it was not the *Autographum* or Record refer'd to in the Postscript of *Wolfe's* Edition of the Articles (which the Author of *Priestcraft* has given¹ us at large from Bishop *Pearson*, together with his own Translation of it) for that Record is there expressly said to have been sign'd by the Upper House of Convocation on the 29th of *January, Anno 1652*, and by the Lower on the 5th of *February* following, which are the very Dates of the Subscriptions of both Houses to this MS. of Arch-bishop *Parker's*, as Mr. *Strype*^{*} informs us; and the Consequence of this will be, either that we must give up that Edition of the Articles, which being in all likelihood the very first, and containing the contested Clause of the 20th Article, is one very good Proof of the Authority of that Clause, or that we must own the MS. of 1562. to be the *Autographum* there refer'd to, and that may seem to be giving up the Clause its self, which is wanting in this MS.

This Difficulty (we have seen) arises upon our Author's¹ first Question about the Original Record of the Articles appeal'd to by Arch-bishop *Laud*, which was, *on what Day that Record was subscrib'd?* And as I there observ'd, that it no way affects the Credit of

This and other Difficulties, that may be rais'd concerning these MSS, do not affect the Authority of the contested Clause.

¹ *Priest-Craft*, p. 33. ^{*} *Annals*, p. 289. ¹ *Priest-Craft*, p. 38.

that Record, that now so many Years after it has been lost, we are not able to answer all the Questions, that may be ask'd about it: so neither, if we were not able to resolve all the Difficulties, that may be rais'd with respect to the affirmative Clause of the Church's Power, would that be any material Objection to the Authority of that Clause, provided the Authority of it be not affected with those Difficulties; which is evidently the Case of that Difficulty, which we are now considering: for which way does it concern, either the Authority of the Clause in question, or the Credit of the Record appeal'd to in its Defence, that it is hard to say at this Distance, on what Day precisely that Record was subscrib'd? Is this any Argument, there was no such Record in Arch-bishop *Laud's* time? which is the very purpose, for which it is alledg'd. Is it not a sufficient Answer to this, and all other Difficulties, that Arch-bishop *Laud* openly appeal'd to this Record, and produc'd an authentick Copy from thence of the 20th Article with the contested Clause in it? and that Dr. *Heylin* both saw the Record, and read the Clause in it *verbatim*. If there be any difficulty after this, with respect to the Date of this Original Record which cannot be easily reconcil'd, either with any other pretended Record, or with any printed Copy whatsoever, be the Credit of either never so great, they must not be permitted to stand in Competition with the Original, which is that upon which the Arch-bishop did then, and we do now principally

cipally found the Authority of the Clause in question.

However to give the clearest Account I can of this Difficulty, where the Fact is at such a distance and there are so few Records of Convocation left to give any Light to it, I shall first set down what farther Account concerning this ancient MS. I have receiv'd in several Letters from two Persons of great Learning and Integrity at Cambridge, who have consulted these MSS. of *Corpus Christi* formerly, and been so obliging to examine them over again now for my Satisfaction, with all the Care and Exactness due to a Matter of such moment; and then from that Account I shall make some Observations with regard to this Difficulty.

If we consider this MS. of 1562, abstracting from the several Alterations suppos'd to have been made in it by Archbishop Parker, it was indeed a fair Draught, tho' not of King Edward's Articles, as our Author falsely represents " it from Mr. Strype, yet of a Reformation of that King's Articles, antecedent to that which reduc'd them to the 39 now in force: for tho' it consisted of 42 Articles, the same Number with those of King Edward, (which probably occasion'd Mr. Strype's " Mistake) yet five of King Edward's Articles are left out of this Collection, viz. the 10th *De gratiâ*; the 16th *De blasphemâ in Spiritum Sanctum*; the 19th *Omnes obligantur ad moralia*

The MS. of 1562. was a fair Draught, not of King Edward's Articles, but of a Reformation of his, antecedent to that now in force,

" *Priest-craft*, p. 34. " *Annals*, p. 289.

A Vindication of the

legis praecepta servanda (the former part of which is added in this MS. to the 6th of King Edward's, *Verus Testamentum non est recipiendum*) the 35th *De Libro Precationum & Cereemoniarum Ecclesiae Anglicanae*; and the 41st intituled *Millenarii*: and there are five new ones added: viz the 5th *De Spiritu Sancto*; the 12th *De bonis operibus*; the 29th *De manducatione Corporis Christi*; & *impios illud non manducare*; the 30th *De utraq; specie*; and the 36th *De Episcoporum & Ministrorum consecratione*; besides these Additions, the Names of the Books of the Old Testament, with the Distinction of the Canonical from the Apocryphal, and a Declaration of all those of the New Testament to be Canonical, are added to the 6th of King Edward's Articles, and the Titles of the Homilies to his 34th. There are these and a few other Differences between the Articles of King Edward, and this MS. of 1562; which is drawn out fair with a form of Subscription at the end of it, *Hos Articulos, &c.* as we have it at large above, * then follow the Names of the two Arch-bishops, and most of the Bishops of both Provinces, and after two or three blank Pages, the Subscription of the Lower House, the form of which is prefix'd in these Words, ^p *Hi quorum nomina sequuntur propriis manibus subscripserunt Libello Articulorum, à Reverendiss. Archiep. Cant. & Episcopis Provinciae Cant. ad inferiorem Domum Convocationis transmissio, quinto Febr. 1562*; from which

* Page 88. ^p Strype's Annals, p. 289.

Account of this MS. and from the Acts of the Convocation of 1562. I observe,

1st. That the Upper House of that Convocation having in their fourth Session on the 19th of *January* order'd the Articles of King *Edward 6th* to be lay'd before some Members of the Lower House, to be examin'd and corrected by them, and brought up to their Lordships the next Session; and having that next and the three succeeding Sessions debated upon the Subject of these Articles, they at last so far agreed upon that Reformation of them, contain'd in this MS. exclusive of the Alterations made in it, as to appoint it to be drawn out fair, in order to be subscrib'd by them in their 9th Session, which was to be on the 29th Day of *January*: for that is the Date of the form of Subscription at the end of this MS: and that Form or (Postscript as we have seen) containing the particular Sum of the Pages of the preceding MS, and of the Articles and Lines in every Page; and each of these Sums, in the Postscript before it was corrected, agreeing with those of the several Pages of the MS. when yet fair, it is evident, that this Postscript or Form of Subscription related to the MS. before it was corrected, and that therefore it was that MS. consider'd as antecedent to the Corrections made in it by Arch-bishop *Parker*, that was intended to be subscrib'd on that 29th Day of *January*: and tho' we have

And that prepar'd to be subscrib'd by the Upper House of Convocation on the 29th of Jan. 1562.

* *Synod. Anglic. Append.* * *Ibid. Act. in Convoc. 1562.*
p. 196, &c. * Page 88.

no Account any where else, that I know of, concerning this intended Reformation of King Edward's Articles, consisting of the same Number of Articles with his, which were 42, and antecedent to that Reformation, which at last reduced them to 39: Yet this MS. it self is a sufficient proof of that. However I observe,

*Yet they did not
subscribe that,
but the 39 Ar-
ticles.*

2dly, That tho' this fair Draught of 42 Articles was thus prepar'd for the Subscription of the upper House against the 29th of *January*, yet it was not to these 42 Articles, but to the last Reformation of them, consisting only of the 39 now in force, that the Upper House did subscribe, on the said 29th of *January*, as appears from the Certificate of the Register printed in the first Edition of the Articles, in which their Subscription bears that date. What hinder'd their subscribing the 42 (as was evidently design'd, when this fair draught of them was order'd) does not now appear: It was most likely some Objections made to those Passages in them, in which they differ'd from the last Reformation of these Articles; and it is not improbable, that after a debate thereupon (which we find they had that Session, just before their Subscription) those Passages were the same day many of them struck out, and the rest altered by the Arch-bishop as they now stand in the MS; and that then the MS, foul as it was, was immediately sign'd by the Bishops. As they had resolv'd upon

that day for their Subscription, so they might be the more willing to keep to their day, to prevent any new Objections that might be rais'd another day, after they had come to this Second Agreement about the Articles: This might make them both alter and sign this MS. in some haste, as it appears they did, from one of the Corrections being made in English, and from their not discounting out of the number of Lines of the first Page the 3 Lines and a half struck out of the third Article, which discount should have been made by altering the Sum of the Lines of that Page in the Postscript from *triginta quatuor* to *triginta unam & dimidium*, as they did that of another from *viginti quatuor* to *quatuordecim*, and so of the rest; which whether omitted by an oversight, or that they were not yet fully resolv'd, whether that part of the third Article shou'd be left out or not, is equally an Argument of their haste; of which also their omitting the contested Clause of the 20th Article may be another not unlikely proof. And as these Omissions, and this Haste is an argument that this Subscription was only preparatory to their last Act, wherein all these oversights were to be rectify'd, and the Articles ingross'd and made up into a Record: So there is all the Reason in the World, that that Record should bear the very same date with this Subscription, which was only made in order to it, and was to be of Authority

And why on the same day, and in so much haste.

And why on the same day, and in so much haste.

As shews it to have been only preparatory to the Record, which must bear the same date, tho' executed long enough afterwards for the Faults of this MS. to be first corrected.

no longer, than till that Record could be prepared; and that might be so long doing, even after the Lower House had also subscrib'd (before which the Articles could not be engross'd) as to give sufficient time to mend the Imperfections of this preparatory Subscription; to turn the *English* Correction into *Latin*, and add the contested Clause.

This is agreeable to the Account, which the Bishop of Salisbury gives* of this Matter; as our Author transcribes† it from him; and all that he excepts against it, only shews his ignorance in the things of which he is disputing. He says this preparatory Subscription is inconsistent with the proceedings of all other Assemblies, and that if the Articles had been thus engross'd in Parchment, after they were subscrib'd by both Houses on Paper, still the Paper Subscription would be the Authentick Original. But if he pleases to inform himself, he will find, that he is greatly mistaken in both these Assertions; and on the contrary, that this is the ordinary way of proceeding in Cases of this nature, and that all Authentick engross'd Instruments, whether National Treaties, grants of the Crown, or proceedings in our Courts of Judicature are the last Authoritative Acts, with relation to the Matters contain'd in them. In Treaties of Peace the Articles are first sign'd in Paper by the several Ministers; and so is the War-rant by the proper Officer in all Grants of

Our Author's
Objection to this
Account.

Confuted from
experience in
parallel Cases
where engross'd
Instruments are
always the last
Authoritative
Acts

* Expos. p. 16.

* Priest-Craft, p. 39. 31.

the Crown; and in Cases of Law the Verdict is given only by the Voices of the Judges in Court: But in order to confirm and record these proceedings, they are all afterwards engross'd in Parchment; and to shew that that is the final Authentick Act, and that all that preceded, whether by way of Subscription or *viva voce* , was only preparatory, and in order to this, and of Authority no longer, than till this could be executed; the Ratification of a Treaty, after it is engross'd, is not sign'd again by the Ministers, who made the first Subscription; nor a Grant of the Crown, by the Officer that sign'd the Warrant; but both of them are pass'd by the Prince himself, the former by his Signature and the Broad Seal, the latter by some other of his Seals; and in like manner the Judgment of any Court of Judicature is finally recorded by an Ingrossment upon Parchment, laid up in the Rolls or other place of Records, without the Subscription of the Judges, who determin'd the Cause. And that this is the Method of Convocations (how little Opinion soever such Friends to the Church and Clergy as our Author, *may have of the reasonable proceedings of such Bodies*) tho' we have few Records to prove it, yet may be presumed from these two MSS, and from another of the Canons of the Convocation of 1571, all three Arch-bishop Parker's, all in the same Volume of *Synodalia* in *Corpus Christi* Library, and all Original Paper Sub-

The same Method us'd in Convocations, As appears from these and other preparatory Subscriptions.

*Which are cer-
tainly none of
the last Authen-
tick Acts.*

scriptions, and yet none of them ingross'd or design'd for Records, as sufficiently appears of the two MSS. of Articles from the Account given of them above; and that of the Canons, is as unlike a Record as either of the other, it equally wants the Royal Authority, and was given away like them by the Arch-bishop, which I have shewn a Record could not have been. Besides what Records were ever afterwards bound up in a Volume among other Papers, as these MSS. are in those called in *Synodalia*; whereas such preparatory Subscriptions, as I suppose all these three MSS to be, being only of Authority to direct the Ingrossment, and to make an Authentick Record of what was agreed upon by such Subscription, are of no longer use or Authority, after that is once made.

Add to all this, what was observ'd above, that neither of these pretended Records of the Articles, found amongst Arch-bishop Parker's Papers, have the Royal Authority affixed to them, without which as the Convocation could neither meet nor act, and which was therefore a necessary ratification of these Articles, when pass'd: So it is evident from all the Copies of them, which have been printed since, that they had that necessary Ratification: And as both the reason of the thing it self, and the constant Practice in all Cases of this nature, teaches us, that this Ratification of the Crown, which is always the last Act in passing such Instruments, must have been therefore affix'd to the ingross'd Record;

so the want of that Ratification to these MSS. is a plain proof that they were no such Records, but only Subscriptions preparatory thereunto, and no longer of any Authority, when such Records were once made up, and duly confirm'd.

Whether this MS of 1562 were again drawn out fair and subscrib'd in Paper after these Alterations made in it, does not where appear; one would be apt to think it was not, because no such other Paper Subscription of the Articles was found in Arch-bishop Parker's Study, and because the Emendations upon this were made with so much Care, as not to deface the MS, and also because this very MS. was likewise subscrib'd some days after by the Lower House of Convocation, to which might be added, that the Corrections made upon the Articles in this MS, and referr'd to by those others made in the Postscript, antecedent to the Subscription, might be thought sufficient for such a preparatory Subscription, as was of Authority only for the directing the ingrossment of the Articles, and making them up into a Record, and was to be superseded by that last Act: And yet we shall see presently, that there is not wanting what may be urg'd on the other side to incline us to believe, that this MS. may have been transcrib'd, and sign'd a second time upon Paper. It is likewise uncertain, whether that Record was subscrib'd by the Convocation, or only read over to them, and pass'd *viva voce*: Which is probably what the Bishop of Salisbury calls

It is uncertain whether this MS. were drawn out fair and subscrib'd again.

And whether the Record were subscrib'd or only pass'd viva voce.

A Vindication of the

* the last voting of the Articles. If the Record was not subscrib'd, then it is not improbable, that there was a second draught of the Articles upon Paper, subscrib'd as preparatory to the Record; and that probably that was the *Autographum* refer'd to in *Wolfe's* Edition of the Articles, and that this Transcript containing the same Number of Pages with the MS. of 1562, from which I suppose it to have been copy'd, (which was very easie to observe, whether the Alterations made in it diminished or augmented the Contents of it) that is the reason, that the *Autographum* there refer'd to, is said to have contain'd 19 Pages, as we own this MS. does, which yet is no Argument, (tho' this Gentleman makes * it one) that this MS. is that *Autographum*; for even according to his Supposition, that the Original, of which I am speaking had been a MS. consisting only of 39 of King Edward's Articles, and those contracted, it need not have fallen short of 19 Pages, if there had been put, either fewer Lines in every Page, or fewer words in each Line, and nothing was easier than this, if they had the least mind to retain the old number of Pages: And yet we have seen, that his Supposition is false; and as our present 39 Articles are not 39 of King's Edward's 42, but only 34 of those, and 5 new ones; so those 34 of King Edward's are some of them much enlarg'd, as well as others contracted; and what with the Addition of the Names of all the Books of

Why in the Postscript of Wolfe's Edition, only the Pages of the Autographum are mention'd, not the Lines, &c. as in this MS.

The Author's mistake as to the danger of a Transcript of this MS. as corrected, falling short of 19 Pages.

the Old-Testament to one of them, and of the *Families*, superadded to those of King *Edward*, to another, and of some few passages to the rest, there was more danger, that a Transcript of this corrected MS. should rather exceed, than fall short of 19 Pages. Accordingly the MS. of 1571 contains as many Pages as this, tho' it be a Translation of only these 39 Articles, and be written in a much smaller hand: But tho' this evidently shews, how little this Gentleman is acquainted with the Articles, concerning which he takes upon him to write, and at once demonstrates the falshood of the ground of his Argument, and the weakness of the Argument it self; yet it must have been difficult in a Transcript even of the same MS, to have observ'd the same number both of Articles and Lines in every Page; and more difficult when the MS. was so much alter'd before it was transcrib'd, whether those Alterations had contracted or enlarged it; and that was most probably the reason, that the Certificate, of the Register of Convocation, printed at the end of *Wolfe's* Edition of the Articles, (which I suppose to have been copy'd, either from the Original Record it self, or from a fair Transcript of this corrected MS, again sign'd by the Convocation) tho' it mentions the number of the Pages of the *Autographum* to which it refers, yet says nothing of that of the Articles and Lines in every Page, which Numbers being both express'd in the Postscript of this MS. as well as that of the Pages, and also alter'd according to that of the Articles

It would rather have exceeded that number.

That variation now mentioned of Wolfe's Postscript from that of this MS. is an Argument, that this MS. is not the Autographum.

Articles and Lines struck out of each Page, where the Arch-bishop made any Alterations in the Articles; there is no reason why they should not have been also taken notice of in the Postscript of *Wolfe's* Edition, if the *Autographum* there refer'd to had been this MS: But if that *Autographum* either were the Original Record of the Articles, to which Arch-bishop *Laud* appeal'd, and that was engross'd in 19 Leaves of Parchment, and subscrib'd by both Houses of Convocation, or were a fair transcript of this foul Subscription, again subscribed in Paper, especially if the Record it self were not subscribed; in either of these Cases the difficulty of observing the same Number of Articles and Lines in every Page of the fair Transcript, that was in the MS. transcrib'd, especially after so many Alterations made in it, is a very probable reason of their leaving out of this printed Postscript, that Account of Lines, &c. which is contain'd, and was so carefully alter'd in the Postscript of this MS, tho' the number of the Pages of the *Autographum*, which there was no difficulty to preserve unaltered, if they had transcrib'd the MS. never so often, be also retain'd in the Print, and agree with that mention'd in this MS; so that as this Gentleman's Argument from the Number of the Pages ascrib'd to the *Autographum* in *Wolfe's* Postscript agreeing with those of this MS, is a very bad one to prove, that this MS is that *Autographum*; so the omission in this printed Postscript, of that Account of the Articles and Lines in each Page of the *Autographum*, which is both contain'd

and

and corrected in this MS, is a very good Argument, that this MS is not that *Autographum*.

Whether therefore this MS of 1562, sub-
scrib'd with the Alterations made in it by
the Arch-bishop, were afterwards transcrib'd
and sign'd in Paper a second time, as
preparatory to the last Authentick Act of
the Convocation, whereby the Articles
herein contain'd were ingross'd and made
up into a Record, and then confirm'd by
the Royal Authority; or this first Paper
Subscription were thought sufficient to direct
and authorize the ingrossment of the Arti-
cles, as they stood thus corrected, with
what little Alterations were to be after-
wards made to a Paper, that was not quite
finished: And whether that ingross'd Re-
cord were also subscrib'd by the Convoca-
tion, and was the *Autographum* referr'd to in
the Certificate above-mention'd, or that
Autographum were a fair Paper Subscription,
and the Record it self not subscrib'd, but
only witnessed by the proper Officer, and
ratified with the Broad Seal: Whichsoever
of these we suppose, it clearly solves the
difficulty, that arises from the agreement of
the date of the Subscription of this MS,
with that of the *Autographum* mention'd in
Wolfe's Postscript; since both such a second
Paper Subscription of these Articles, if there
were any, and such an ingross'd Record, if
it were subscrib'd, must certainly bear date
from the day of the first Subscription, as
the day both first appointed for signing the
Articles, and on which they were actually
sign'd,

The Autographum, whether Record, or another preparatory Subscription, might be sign'd after this MS, and yet bear the same date.

sign'd, at least by several of the Bishops; for the date being set down in the form of the Subscription, which is prefix'd to the Subscribers Names, it cannot appear from thence, that the Subscription was finished the same day; since if any Bishops had been absent that day, and had not subscrib'd till afterwards, the date of the Subscription already fix'd, would certainly not have been alter'd on their Account; nor indeed could it be alter'd, without cancelling the whole Paper. This shews, that the *Autographum*, whether Original Record, or another preparatory Paper Subscription, might be actually sign'd after this MS of 1562, and yet bear the same date: and as Subscriptions, in which the date is set before the Subscribers Names, cannot be concluded to have been any more than begun according to that date; so such as are to be afterwards repeated upon a fair Transcript, whether that Transcript be the Record it self, or only preparatory to it, tho' they ought certainly to bear date from the day, on which the Matters therein contain'd were first agreed to and subscrib'd, yet cannot be actually made, till such Transcript or Record be first drawn, which is often a Business of some time. Nor is it so much the day, on which these Articles pass'd, as that they did actually pass in that Convocation, that we are to learn from the date of their Subscription; tho' that date certainly answers the time, in which the first preparatory Subscription was agreed upon, and most

probably begun, whether it were concluded at the same time or no.

On this Occasion it may not be improper to observe, that our Author himself takes notice from the Acts of this Convocation, that the true time of the Subscription of the Lower House to these Articles, does not exactly agree with the date of it, assign'd at the end of the *Corpus Christi College*

That the date of the Subscription of this MS does not exactly agree with

MS of 1562, and in the Postscript of *Wolfe's* Edition of the Articles; for whereas it is certify'd in both those Places, that all the Clergy of the Lower House subscrib'd on the 5th of February, It appears, says he, from these Acts, that there was a double Subscription of the Articles, first by some Members of the Lower House, and afterwards by the Body of that House on the 5th of February.

ly agree with the true time of signing it, appears from the Author's own Observations.

And yet if he please to look again, he will find that there was a greater difference than this, between the true time of their signing, and that ascrib'd to it; and that the Subscription which he observes to have been double, was in that way of reckoning at least quadruple: For on the 5th of February^b, which was their 11th Session, the Prolocutor and six Members of the Lower House presented to the Bishops the Articles which had been sent down to them, and were already subscrib'd by some of the Lower House, praying that all who had not yet sign'd them, might do it either in a full Assembly of their own House, or

Tho' the difference was yet greater than he takes notice of.

^a Priest-Craft p. 43.

^b Act. in Convocation. A^o.

1562. Synod. Anglic. p. 206, 207.

upon their refusal, might be compell'd to do it before their Lordships. Upon this they were appointed to lay before the Upper House at the next Session the Names of all, that had not subscrib'd; and accordingly on the 10th of *February*, which was the 12th Session, the Articles were again carried up to their Lordships, with an Account that some of the Lower House had subscrib'd them since the last Session, but that they had not yet all subscrib'd; which occasion'd another Order of the Upper House, that the Names of such, who had not yet subscrib'd, should be laid before them the next Session. After which we have no farther mention, what was done in compleating this Subscription. It appearing therefore from hence, that tho' some of the Lower House subscrib'd the Articles not improbably before the 5th of *February*, and some of them between that and the 10th, nay and some even after the 10th, yet they made no scruple to date their Universal Subscription upon the 5th, as the day most probably, on which the Lower House appointed to subscribe them, and on which they were likely subscrib'd by the greatest Number of them; and our sagacious Discoverer of Frauds himself finding nothing to carp at in a proceeding, that so well answered the main end of it, which was to attest the Subscription of that Convocation to these Articles, not to tell in how many, and on what days precisely they were subscrib'd: What hinders, but that the same Articles might be again actually subscrib'd, either upon another

ther preparatory Paper Transcript of this corrected MS, in which then necessary Emen-
dations of this were first made, or upon the
ingross'd Record itself, some time after this
first Subscription, and yet bear the same
date with that? Especially since it was
that first Subscription, by which the Arti-
cles were agreed to and pass'd, and this o-
ther supposed Subsequent to that, was only
renewing, or rather confirming the same
Act; which as it could not be all perfected
at once, because the Instruments to be sign'd
must have been some time preparing; so
fixing several dates to it, might have been
judg'd to be making it different Acts.

But tho' this answers the difficulty from *Altho' the Auto-*
the agreement of the date of the MS of *graphum* were
1562, with that of the *Autographum* refer'd *transcrib'd from*
to in *Wolfe's* Edition; and shews that the *this MS, yet it*
Record appeal'd to by Arch-bishop *Land* *did not there-*
might be actually sign'd after the MS of *fore want the*
1562, and yet bear the same date; and *contested*
therefore that this agreement of dates is no *Clause.*
Argument, that this MS is that *Autogra-*
phum; yet it may be objected, that that
Autographum, whatever it was, being sup-
posed to have been transcrib'd from this
MS, and this MS wanting the contested
Clause, therefore that *Autographum* must
also have wanted it. To which I an-
swer,

1st, Whether that *Autographum* be suppo-
sed to have been a Transcript from this first
Subscription, sign'd again in Paper as pre-
paratory to the Record, or to have been

Some things in
this MS. must
have been al-
ter'd.

the Record it self, it is certain, that some things left imperfect in this first Subscription, must have been alter'd in that Transcript, such as the Title of the 16th Article, which in this MS is *De peccato after Baptism*, where even the same Language is not kept; and the latter part of the 3d Article, mark'd indeed with *Minium* in this MS, but not finally resolv'd to be left out; because the Lines containing it so mark'd, are not discounted in the Sum of the Lines of this Page at the end of the MS, as the rest of the Lines of this MS are, which the Arch-bishop's *Minium* had superseded. And,

The proper time
for altering
them, was be-
tween this pre-
paratory Sub-
scription, and
the ingrossing of
it.

2dly, As these Alterations were necessary to be made in order to the ingrossment, so there was both time enough to consider and resolve upon them, and any other Alterations that might be thought necessary, between this preparatory Subscription, and the ingrossing of it; and that was the proper time to make them, viz. before that last Authoritative Act, with relation to the passing of the Articles; for after they were once engross'd, and had also the Confirmation of the Royal Authority, it had then been too late to make any Alterations in them, without beginning all again; whereas till then, tho' the first and most essential Act with regard to the Convocation was over, and that to which all that follow'd was to refer (I mean the first Subscription of both Houses) yet the Matter was to be still look'd upon, as only *in fieri*; the Articles thus agreed upon by the Subscriptions of

of both Houses were to be recorded, as having been so agreed upon, and afterwards to be confirm'd by the Queen; and in order to that, they were either to be sign'd again, if not upon another Paper Transcript, because of the Imperfections of this, yet upon the ingross'd Instrument; or at least were to be voted again, if that ingross'd Copy were not also sign'd; for since it was to be recorded, that the Convocation had pass'd and subscrib'd the Articles, according to the tenour and date of those Subscriptions, it was also necessary to the due Execution of that Record, that the Articles thus ingross'd should be read over in Convocation, and either subscrib'd again, or at least pass'd *vivâ voce*; which agrees with that Account which the Learned Author of *Synodus Anglicana* gives us of the manner of passing business in Convocation, *viz.* that *the Instrument after being ingross'd was always read publickly in the Upper House before the Arch-bishop, Bishops, and Clergy, and by them finally agreed to either vivâ voce, or by Subscription, adding that Articles, Canons, and Constitutions usually pass'd the latter way: From the first Subscription therefore to this final Agreement, or last voting, the matter was still in fieri; and whatever Alterations were made in that time, as they must have had the Consent of the whole Convocation, without which they could neither have been put into the Record, nor much less*

All such Alterations pass'd with the ingross'd Instrument had the same Authority with the rest of the Articles

have been suffered to remain in it, when that Record was read and pass'd the Convocation; so that Consent, and the Royal Confirmation added to it, gave them all the Authority, that any Acts of Convocation, as such, can have. And,

The Insertion of the contested Clause was an emendation very proper to be made with the rest.

3dly, As to the contested Clause of the 20th Article, tho' the Addition of that was not an Alteration of equal necessity with the other two above-mention'd, viz. turning of an *English* Correction into the same Language with the rest of the Articles, and the determining about a Clause of the third Article, which was left in suspense at their first Subscription: And therefore the Article of the Church's Authority had continued for ten Years without that Clause: Yet it could not but be thought a very proper Emendation, at least of the Method of that Article, that professing to treat of the Authority of the Church, it should first expressly assert that Authority, before it lays down the due Limitations of it; especially since (as was observed above) the very compiling of, and agreeing upon these Articles, was an exercise of that Authority; and this being rather a Correction of the Method, than any Addition to the Substance of the Article, was an Alteration the more easily made after the first Subscription. But to put this Matter beyond all doubt, as this Alteration was very proper, and those other were necessary to be made after the Subscription to the Articles, and that was the fittest time to make them, so,

4thly,

4tly, It is evident, that they were all actually then made. The Title of the 16th Article, half *Latin* and half *English* in this MS, is corrected in all the Printed Copies since, as well as the latter part of the 3d Article left out, which in this MS remains in suspense; and thence it is reasonable to conclude, that these Alterations were likewise made in the Record that last pass'd the Convocation: And tho' there have been some Copies printed without the Affirmative Clause of the Church's Power, yet as there cannot be a greater presumption, than these other Alterations made after the Subscription, that that also was added to the Articles between the subscribing of them, and the making them up into a Record: So there cannot be a more undeniable Proof of this, now that Record is lost, than what has been alleg'd above, from an Authentick Copy of the 20th Article with that Clause in it, taken from that Record, and produced in the Star-Chamber by Arch-bishop *Laud*, at a time when the Record was yet extant, and for what appears, might have been seen by any one that desired it; and from the Testimony of Dr. *Heylin*, who was an Eye-witness of it, and read this Clause in the Record *verbatim*.

And now since it thus appears, that some Alterations were to be made to the Articles between their first Subscribing and their last Voting, that that was the proper and only time for making them, and that accordingly they were actually made, and this of adding the controverted Clause, among

That and the other Alterations were actually made at that time.

Therefore tho' this MS. were the very Autographum referr'd to in it, that would be no proof, that the contested Clause wanting in it, was consequently wanting in the Record.

As appears from a parallel Case.

among them, why may we not proceed one step farther, and assert, not only that the Agreement of the Date of this MS. of 1562. with that of the *Autographum* referr'd to in the Postscript of *Wolfe's* Edition, is no Proof that this MS. is that *Autographum*; but that if it were an Argument of this, and this MS. were the very *Autographum* referr'd to in that Postscript, and that Postscript were an exact Copy of the Certificate of the Register subjoin'd to the Record without any Variations, yet even all this would be no Proof, that the contested Clause wanting in this MS. was also wanting in the Record, since we have such evident Proof to the contrary? The Account I have given above of the manner of agreeing upon Articles of Peace, &c. from what has been observ'd in all National Treaties for 200 Years and upwards, (as appears from the great *Recueil des Traitez*, printed at Amsterdam, Anno 1700. in four Volumes) is so agreeable to the Method of passing Business in Convocation, as far as can be learnt from that little ^a *Light we have from the Registers concerning the Circumstances of it*; and there is so much resemblance in several Particulars between a Convocation and such a Treaty; the same Royal Authority being necessary to the assembling of both; the Plenipotentiaries of the one and the Members of the other having equally a full Power to agree upon the respective Matters before them; and the Ratification of the Prince

^a *Synod. Anglic. ubi sup.*

being alike requisite to authorize the Agreement in both Cases; that tho' there be several essential Differences between them; the Convocation acting by its own Authority, only with the Prince's Approbation, the Ministers in Treaties acting purely by the Royal Authority; yet the Methods of proceeding in the one, which are well known, may give us some Light, where that is wanting, to discover those in the other. Let us therefore suppose, that this MS. of 1562. were the preparatory Subscription of the Plenipotentiaries to the Articles of a Treaty of Peace, and that the Clause wanting in it were found in the Ratification of the Treaty; would any Man question, but that that Clause had all the Authority, which the rest of the Articles had? And what then becomes of our Author's Assertion, 'that tho' these Articles had been ingross'd in Parchment (as tho' they could have finally pass'd without that) and those Parchments were still in being, they would not be of equal Authority with the Originals in Paper, sign'd by both Houses of Convocation? Why, was not this Ingrossment subsequent to that Paper? And was not the passing of this, whether by Subscription or *viva voce*, Posterior to the signing of the other? If so, then by his own Argument, the subsequent Subscription (or voting) of this ingross'd Instrument must null all former Subscriptions. Why else were not these MSS. pleaded against Arch-bishop Land, while the Record was still in being, but

The Author's Assertion, that the ingross'd Instrument would not be of equal Authority with the preparatory Subscription, is evidently false.

^e Priest-Craft p. 31. ^f Ibid. p. 38.

only because those primitive Libellers had more sense than to imagine, that any preparatory Instruments whatever could be of the least Authority against the Record it self? This was the final Agreement to the Articles, and was accordingly ratify'd by the Queen, which is not pretended of any of those Paper Preparatory Subscriptions; and therefore even at this Day to argue from any of them, what was, or was not pass'd with these Articles, contrary to the expresse Letter of the ingross'd Record, for which we have the Testimony both of an authentick Copy, and of an Eye-witness, and which his Argument supposes, tho' it does not grant it, is the same degree of Folly, as it would be, if the Model of *St. Paul's*, from which the Building varies in many Instances, should happen to outlive the Church, to argue from that Model's consisting in the main only of one Order of Building, that the Body of the Church did not contain two Orders, tho' there were Eye-witnesses to the contrary, that had seen it standing.

And this may suffice both for an Account of the Subscription of this MS. of 1562. on the same Days that the *Autographum* referred to in *Wolfe's* Edition is mention'd to have been subscrib'd, and for an Answer to the Difficulty arising from the Agreement of those Dates. I proceed to give some farther Account also of the MS. of 1571, and of the Subscription that was begun to be made to it.

This MS. of 1571. seems to have been a Translation of that of 1562. including the

Alte-

Alterations made in it by Arch-bishop Parker; and it is not improbable, that having that foul Copy by him, which was likely preserv'd for the sake of the Subscription, and that the Original Articles of that Convocation being in his Office, and at a distance, he chose to have this translated, intending the Articles should in this other Convocation of 1571. be pass'd in *English*: *And of the Subscription to it being left unfinished.* or he might have this Translation ready by him (for it may seem to have been made some time before, as was observ'd above) and not taking notice of its wanting the contested Clause, which might be omitted either designedly by the Transcriber, or because translated from that other MS, which wanted it; the Convocation might resolve to make their first Preparatory Subscription upon this MS, and accordingly actually begin it; but as soon as it was taken notice of, that the Clause was omitted, and the Upper House (it may be) acquainted, that the Lower was signing the Articles on a printed Book, they might immediately break off their Subscription to this MS, and resolve to sign a printed Book too, and accordingly sign it; all this I say is very probable, and thus much, we have seen, is certain, that on the 11th of *May* 1571. the Upper House of Convocation did begin to subscribe this MS; that it was hardly sign'd by half that House, before the Subscription was broke off and left imperfect; and that it was never so much as begun by the Lower House; but that on the contrary the Lower House did on the same 11th Day of

May make a full Subscription to the Articles of the Convocation of 1562, on a *Latin* Copy of them still extant, with the Label of their Names tack'd to it; and it is farther certain, that the Upper House did also sign the same Articles of 1562. some time in this Convocation of 1571. as appears from the Ratification of the Articles, printed at the end of them, in all the Editions since that Year inclusively.

If this Account of these MSS. be not sufficient to satisfy all the Difficulties that may be rais'd about them, yet it is enough for my purpose, to have shewn, that neither of them is of any Authority in the Question before us; and that their wanting the affirmative Clause of the Church's Power is no Argument, that that Clause is not equally authentick with all the rest of the Articles. I shall therefore now proceed to examine what the Author of *Priestcraft* farther advances to prove, that the contested Clause of the Church's Power was not contain'd in the *Imprinted Book* of the Articles, which the Parliament oblig'd the Clergy to subscribe, and which he therefore pretends was ratify'd by Parliament. I have already answer'd what he alledges in proof of this from the pretended Concession of Arch-bishop *Laud*, and made it appear, that that great Prelate was so far from granting this, that he prov'd on the contrary by most undeniable Arguments, that this Clause had all the Authority, whether of Convocation or Parliament, which any other part of the Articles had.

What the Author farther alledges to prove, that the contested Clause was not in the Imprinted Book refer'd to by the Act of Parliament. 13 Eliz. c. 12.

His next Proof ^f is from the Testimony of Dr. Thomas Fuller, who says ^g that the Clause of the Church's Power is omitted in the English and Latin Articles set forth in 1571, when they were first ratify'd by Act. He should have said in an English and Latin Edition of that Year, viz. in a corrupt and spurious both English and Latin Edition; ^{His Argument from Dr. Fuller's Testimony answer'd.} for I shall shew him presently, that the English and Latin Editions of that Year, I mean those that are genuine, and even more than one of those English Editions, have the controverted Clause in them; and yet if all the Editions of that Year had been corrupted, how would it hence follow, that this Clause was not ratify'd, as he calls it, by Parliament? Is he sure that any of the Editions of the Year 1701. came out before this Act pass'd, which he himself says, ^h was in the beginning of that Year, whereas those Editions are all later than the Convocation of that Year, as appears from the Ratification printed in them all, and expressly mentioning that Convocation's having confirm'd the Articles? Or if he were sure of this, how does he know, that the Book referr'd to in that Act was one of those Editions? but I have ⁱ sufficiently expos'd the Weakness of this Argument above, and have there also shewn ^k from Dr. Heylin, and the Act of Parliament it self, that there never was any formal Ratification of these Articles, by Parliament; and also observ'd ^l (which is our

^f Sup. p. 25. ^g Ch. Hist. L. 9. Cent. 16. p. 74. ^h Priest-Craft p. 11. ⁱ Sup. p. 25. 26. ^k Supp. 26, 39, 68, 69.

And that from
Dr. Heylin's.

Libeller's next Argument ^m) how far Dr. Heylin is from confirming any Account of Fuller's; in prejudice of the Authority of the Clause in question: to which I shall here add, that besides what this Gentleman himself quotes, ⁿ and what I have quoted above ^o from Dr. Heylin in Defence of the Clause against Dr. Fuller, he shews ^p how his great Patron Arch-bishop Laud had vindicated the Authority ^q of this Clause, both from the first printed Copy of the Articles, and from the Original Record it self; and it is in Confirmation of that Copy from thence under the Hand of a Publick Notary, which that Arch-bishop produc'd in the Star-Chamber; that his Chaplain adds (what I have cited above, tho' with some Interruption, and therefore shall now repeat all together) in these Words. *And thus much, says he, I can say of mine own Knowledge, that having occasion to consult the Records of Convocation, I found this controverted Clause verbatim in these following Words, Habet Ecclesia Ritus statuendi jus, & in fidei controversiis Authoritatem.* Which, to observe that by the way, is also a confirmation of the Authority of that Printed Copy of the Articles, which was likewise appeal'd to by Arch-bishop Laud, viz. the Latin one of the Year 1563, published, says Dr. Heylin, but very few Months after (he might have said, perhaps in the very same Month, that) *the Articles had pass'd in the Convoca-*

And therein by
the way a Con-
firmation of the
Authority of
Wolfe's Editi-
on of the Arti-
cles.

^m Priest-Craft 15. ⁿ Ibid. ^o Sup. p. 39, 68, 69.
^p Exam. Hist. p. 144.

tion: For this reading of the Clause here exactly agrees with that of the said *Latin* printed Copy, whereas in the latter Editions the word *Ritus* has been explain'd by the Addition of *five Ceremonias*. After such an Evidence of the Authority of the contested Clause, both from the earliest printed Copy, and from the Original Records, Dr. Heylin might well wonder^a, that Fuller, having access to those Records, and making frequent use of them in this very History, should yet therein declare himself unable to decide the doubt, whether the Addition of this Clause was made by the Bishops, or the Substraction of it by the opposite Party. But none, says he, so blind, as he that will not see; and I hope this is not confirming any Account of this Matter, prejudicial to the Authority of the Clause in question. But He brings them that Account of Fuller's, which this Gentleman says Dr. Heylin confirms, is that the Articles were published without the Clause in the Year 1571; and this also my Lord of Sarum, and Arch-bishop Laud himself are afterwards brought to attest. Does any one then deny this? And do not both the Arch-bishop and his Chaplain give a very probable reason of it? In the Year 1571, says Dr. Heylin^r, (*the Puritan Faction beginning then to grow very strong*) the Articles were again printed, both in Latin and English, and this Clause left out: he adds, that they were published according to those Copies in the Harmony of Confessions printed at Geneva

He brings them and others to attest what no Body denies, and what those he appeals to, give a probable Account of.

Which may help us to discover, who tore the 20th Article out of a Copy of the Oxford Edition of 1636, now in the Bodleian Library.

^a Exam. Hist. p. 145. ^r Ibid.

Our Author argues against the Clause from Dr. Fuller, and yet owns that Dr. Fuller was for it.

A^o. 1612, and afterwards in an Edition of the Articles at Oxford A^o. 1636, *tho' soon after rectify'd*; which I the rather mention, because they have now in the Publick Library of Oxford a *Latin* Edition, printed there that very Year, which if it were the Edition, wherein this corrupt omission was rectify'd, that will enable us to give a very good Account, how the Leaf came to be torn out, in which this Article was contain'd. But to return to our Author. He should therefore at least have inform'd us, in what terms Dr. *Heylin* confirms that *Historian's* Account of this matter, as also that he, as well as his Patron, imputes the omission of the Clause in those Editions of 1571 only to the malicious cunning of the opposite Faction. He owns 'this indeed of the Arch-bishop, and I hope I have above sufficiently answered his Objections to what that Prelate says upon this Occasion. I have done it chiefly from Dr. *Heylin*, who to justify his own Account of this Matter, alledges that of the Arch-Bishop, and vindicates both against the insinuations of Dr. *Fuller*, which our Enemy to *Priest-Craft* vainly attempts to form into Objections, and yet he is forc'd to own 'that even Dr. *Fuller* was so far misled, as he expresses it, by *Arch-bishop Laud's Speech in the Star-Chamber*, as to imagine that the controverted Clause was extant in the Records of the Convocation of 1562, therefore he imagin'd it pass'd in that Convocation, and that in 1562 the Articles stood with this Clause, and therefore his Observation of their not being obligatory to punishment from that time, &c. could

¹ *Priest-Craft* p. 19.

² *Ibid.* p. 15.

not be made upon their Authority, as they stood without it. However, that Speech has so far misled all the World as well as Dr. Fuller in this Controversy, that from that time it has been intirely laid asleep, and would in all probability have slept on for ever, if this busy Discoverer had not thought fit to awaken it, I fear with no better Design than theirs, who first rais'd it against Arch-bishop Laud. But to return to what he says of Dr. Fuller, whereas he afterwards represents " the Dr. to have affirmed, *that this Clause was omitted in the printed Book, to which the Parliament requir'd the Subscription of the Clergy* ; and argues that Dr. Heylin also own'd this, because *his Zeal both for the Authority of the Clause, and against his Adversary, Fuller would otherwise have prevail'd with him to deny, that it was omitted in that Book*: It is false that Dr. Fuller affirmed this, and therefore it would have been ridiculous in this Place for Dr. Heylin to have denied it. What Fuller says, *is, that the Clause was omitted in the Articles set forth in 1571, when they were first ratified by Act*, or as our Author at last explains him, when the Parliament requir'd Subscription to them. To which this Gentleman must first subjoin, that the Book referr'd to by that Act of Parliament was precisely one of those set forth that Year, nay one of the Spurious Editions of that Year, (a Proposition which I defy him to make good) before he can so much as infer from that

Dr. Fuller does not say that the Clause was omitted in the Book referr'd to by Parliament.

Expression of Dr. Fuller's, that *the Clause of the Church's Power was omitted in the imprinted Book, to which the Parliament required the Subscription of the Clergy*: So far is the Dr. from asserting any such thing expressly, as he is pleas'd to represent him.

This is not the only falshood, of which the Libeller is guilty in this Paragraph.

But this is not the only falshood he is guilty of in this very Paragraph. By way of Note on Dr. Heylin's Censure of the Church Historian, for so dreaming of the Power of Parliaments in Matters of Religion, as not to suffer an Act of Convocation to be obligatory without the Confirmation of Parliament, He is pleas'd to tell us "*that the Convocation of 1562 disclaim'd all pretence to a Legislative Power in Matters of Religion, so much insisted on of late, says he by our High Church Priests; and that they have very different notions of their own and of the Parliament's Power from this reverend High Church-man, as he scornfully styles Dr. Heylin, I hope he designs to include in this Reflection all the Priests that are concerned in that of the Title of his Book, and that is all the Clergy of the Church of England to a Man: He must do this, if he means that are bigger Church than himself; who if he be the Person he is generally taken for, is known to be so wretched a Churchman, as to dispute all the Articles of the Christian Faith; to be a perfect Factor for Atheism it self; and to run up and down vending Objections, that are none of his own, against the very Being of a Go*

Whom he means by High-Church Priests, and how wretchedly low he is himself.

But whoever he means by his *Highb Church* None of our Priests I hope so low, as to think no Acts of Convocation valid, till ratify'd by Parliament.
Priests, I hope we have none in our Church so low, as to question the Authority of a Convocation, where their Acts are not ratify'd by Parliament; or to imagine, that our Articles of Religion themselves were of no force for nine Years after they were pass'd, because it was so long before the Parliament took notice of them in any publick Act, and when they did, it was not with any Design of confirming them, as I have already shewn, but only to support the Ecclesiastick Authority with the secular Power, to promote the Peace of the Church, for which these Articles were first made; and whereas several of the Clergy refus'd to subscribe them, to injoin Subscription to them under a severe Penalty: and that as to Articles, not deriving their Authority from any pretended Confirmation of this Act, of which there is not the least mention, but pass'd and agreed upon in full Convocation, as long since as the Year 1562, and then put forth by Royal Authority, as the contrary was one of the Doctrines, that in 1640 made way for the Destruction both of Church and State, was one of the Resolves * of the Long Parliament, preparatory to their famous *Root and Branch* Act, by which we may guess at this Gentleman's aim in reviving it: So it seems, that even as early as the Parliament of 1571, there were like Endeavours to That was one of the Doctrines of 1640, to make way for the destruction of Church and State, and is probably now reviv'd for the same end.
Some Endeavours that way as early as the Parliament of

* *Nelson's Collect.* Vol. 1. p. 678. † *Ibid.* Vol. 2. 1571.
 p. 248, &c.

Check'd by Q.
Elizabeth.

undermine the Authority of the Church, and to resolve her Power into that of the Parliament, which was the occasion of that Answer to the Commons, from the Lords, when the Act enjoining Subscription to the 39 Articles was under debate, *That the Queen's Majesty having been made privy to the said Articles, liketh very well of them, and mindeth to publish them, and have them executed by the Bishops, by dictation of her Highness Regal Authority of Supremacy of the Church of England, and not to have the same dealt in by Parliament.* By which Answer it appears, that the Queen's Notion of the Convocation's as well as of her own Power, and of that of the Parliament, was less different from the Reverend High-Church man's, whom this well-bred Gentleman so much ridicules, than from his and theirs, who like him are for submitting the very Articles of Religion to the determination of Parliaments, that a few such Gentlemen as themselves, may one day be enabled by that means, to establish even Atheism by Law: For they have a certain secret of erecting even the most infamous Rump into a Parliament, and of making Ordinances without either Sovereign or House of Lords. But how does the Author of Priest-Craft know, what Notions the Convocation of 1562 had of their own and of the Parliament's Power? And where did they disclaim all pretence to a Legislative Power in Matters of Religion? Why, Mr.

Strype informs him, that at the end of
 Arch-bishop Parker's MS of 1562, after the
 Subscribers Names, are added these Words: *Ista Subscriptio facta est ab omnibus sub hac*
protestatione, quod nihil statuerunt in prajudi-
cium cujusquam Senatus-consulti, sed tantum
supplicem libellum, petitiones suas continen-
tem, humiliter offerunt. I need not set down
 this great Critick's translation of them,
 unless it be to correct it; for the Con-
 vocation does here protest against enact-
 ing any thing in prejudice, (not of the
 Privileges and Rights of either House of
 Parliament, as he is pleas'd to English *cu-*
jusquam Senatus-consulti, but only) of any
 Statute or Act of Parliament; and yet nei-
 ther that Protestation in either of those
 Senses; nor their offering up these Articles
 by way of Petition, humbly desiring the
 Assent and Ratification of the Royal Autho-
 rity, according to what was observ'd a-
 bove from the Act of Submission, and the
 King's Declaration, can be interpreted any
 thing more, than taking all possible precau-
 tion, not to be thought to assume a Power,
 which did not belong to them, as certainly
 that of reversing Acts of Parliament did
 not; which is so far from disclaiming a
 Power, that did belong to them, viz. that
 of making Canons and Constitutions, and
 any other Ecclesiastical Acts, not repugnant
 to Acts of Parliament, that their very pro-
 testation against the former, was an Affir-
 mation of the latter, according to that Old

Our Author mis-
 represents the
 Protestation of
 the Convocation
 of 1562, and
 does not so much
 as construe it
 right.

It is so far from
 disclaiming the
 Power we con-
 tend for, that
 it asserts it.

His Author
 tells him a dif-
 ferent intent,
 for which it
 was made.

Supra p. 79. Annals p. 291.

Rule, *exceptio firmat regulam*. And does Mr. Strype, who furnishes him with this Argument, make the same use of it? Does he say this Protestation was enter'd, to disclaim all pretence to make Ecclesiastical Acts, viz. Canons and Constitutions? For as an Evidence, that they do not pretend to the Legislative Power, which this Gentleman speaks of, they do not call their Acts by the Name of Laws. On the contrary, to shew the Ingenuity of our Author, Mr. Strype tells us ' most expressly, that this protestation was made for another end, *cautiously written*, says he, *for fear, (as it seems) of a pramunire.*

Bishop Pearson is unjustly brought to attest that the controverted Clause was wanting in the Book of Articles, referr'd to by Parliament.

But to return to the Arguments, by which our Author in vain endeavours to prove, that the Clause of the Church's Power was not contain'd in the imprinted Book referred to by the Act, that enjoin'd Subscription to the Articles; his next proof of this is in part from the Authority of Bishop Pearson, who as well as Arch-bishop Laud (call'd in above as an Evidence in this behalf) is of Authority sufficient in whatever our Libeller can pervert to his purpose. But in every thing that makes against him, they do nothing but falsify and prevaricate. Bishop Pearson, as this Gentleman tells us, says, that in the Year 1571, the Articles were reprinted, and then the Act of Parliament was publish'd, which words, says he, do imply his Opinion, that the Book pass'd by Parliament was printed in 1571. I wish he had shew'd us, how they imply this:

^c Annals p. 291.

^d Priest-Craft. p. 16.

He was not able to do that, and therefore, *He does not say, nor certainly imply, that the Book refer'd to by Parliament, was an Edition of 1571, printed by R. Jugge and J. Cawood, Printers to the Queen's Majesty, Anno Domini 1571.* for a fuller Confirmation of the Matter, he refers us to this farther Explanation, where the Bishop says, that the Articles of Religion, to which King Charles I's Declaration is affix'd, are the same with the Articles mention'd in the 13th of Elizabeth, in Number, Nature, Substance, and Words, as he is assur'd, having himself diligently collated them with an Edition of the Articles printed by R. Jugge, and J. Cawood, Printers to the Queen's Majesty, Anno Domini 1571. Neither does this certainly infer, that he was of Opinion, that the imprinted Book refer'd to by the Parliament, was a Book printed 1571, by Jugge and Cawood; it only infers, that whatever printed Book the Act might refer to, which is not specify'd in it, he thought that of 1571 the likeliest to agree with that refer'd to by the Act, being printed the very same Year. But allow it to infer that, which he concludes from it, to have been Bishop Pearson's Opinion; does it not also infer his Opinion, and indeed declare his certain Knowledge, that the contested Clause was contain'd in that Book? But the Author of Priestcraft has that very Edition without the Clause. He is mistaken; he has not that very Edition: He has only a spurious Edition of that very Year; for after to express an Evidence as that of Bishop Pearson, a Prelate, whose Authority is of great esteem with all good Men, and was never call'd into question but by this Reviler of God's Priests; no Man that will admit of any Testimony, can doubt, but that the controverted Clause was

But he does say, that the contested Clause was contain'd in that Edition.

Which is a better proof, that there was an Edition of that Year with the Clause, than 20 spurious Copies of that Year without it, are that there was not.

was found in that Edition of 1571, which that Bishop collated so diligently; and though there appear'd 20 Copies of that Year without the Clause, and 20 such as our *Libeller* should aver, that they were the very same Editions with that, which Bishop *Pearson* collated; yet his single Testimony, with all good and unprejudiced Men would outweigh them all; and no Man that knows this Bishop's Character, but would from his having positively asserted, that himself had diligently collated one of that Edition, with one that had the Clause in it, and found all the Articles in both, *the same in Number, Nature, Substance and Words*, much rather conclude, that there was certainly, at least at that time, an Impression of *Jugg's* and *Cawood's* of the Year 1571, with the Clause, how many soever there might be without it; than because there now appears a Copy of that Year, and under the Names of those Printers, without the Clause, that therefore this is that very Edition, which Bishop *Pearson* collated; and that his Testimony as to that other with the Clause, is a downright *Forgery and Falsification*. But though this cruel Accusation is founded only upon an idle Presumption, and pronounced with the utmost Rancour and ill Manners, yet we must

Our Accuser is not so angry with the Bishop, as with the Great Expositor on the Creed.

do our *Accuser* the Justice to own, that he is not half so angry with Bishop *Pearson*, as with the Great *Expositor* upon the Creed. A little enquiry into Ecclesiastical History convinces him, that nothing is more reconcileable in Practice, than writing Expositions on the Creed, and downright *Forgery and Falsification*.

tion. A very little in good truth, the least *His Skill in*
 in the World; and that accompany'd with *Logick is as*
 as little Skill in Logick. *little, as in Ec-*
 in the Year 1571, printed an Edition of the *clesiastical Hi-*
 Articles without the contested Clause; *story.*
 therefore there was no Edition with that
 Clause printed by them that Year. He has
 by him an Edition of theirs of that date,
 that wants the Clause; therefore Bp. Pearson
 never saw one of theirs of the same Date
 that had it. That is to say, it is impossible
 there should be more Editions than one in a
 Year, by the same Printers, or so much as
 under the same Printers Names. Of this our
 Discoverer of Frauds is so confident, that he
 reserves this for his last Argument, to prove, *His last Argu-*
 that the Clause of the Church's Power was not *ment, that the*
 ratify'd, as he calls it, by Parliament. And by *contested Clause*
 this Argument pretends to put the matter *was not rati-*
 upon such an Issue, as may clearly (not only *fy'd by Parlia-*
 prove, but) demonstrate his point. And I *ment, is here*
 am so ready to join issue with him, and so *anticipated in*
 much in haste to vindicate Bp. Pearson, that I *defence of Bi-*
 shall anticipate this formidable Argument, *shop Pearson.*
 and accept his Challenge, before I come re-
 gularly to it. He desires those, who defend
 the Authority of the contested Clause, to pro-
 duce any one English Edition of the Articles
 printed in or before the Year 1571, that con-
 tains the Clause of the Churches Power in
 it. And what if this cannot be done?
 Why, then it is a demonstration, says he,
 that the Parliament pass'd the Articles with-
 out the clause. Why so? Because they could
 not pass the printed Book, before it was prin-

His inference, that if there be no such Copy now, therefore there was none 140 Years ago, is another instance of his skill in Logick.

That I confess has something the air of a Demonstration; but is it equally demonstrable, that there could not be any such printed Copy then extant, if we cannot at this distance, and after so much Industry, as has been probably us'd to suppress them, produce one of those Copies now? This is another instance of our Author's great Skill in Logick. We can find no such Impression now, therefore there was none 140 Years ago. But what if we can find one now? I hope, since our Author puts the cause upon this issue, he will at least stand by it. No such matter. One spurious Edition of that Year without the Clause is much more to his purpose, than 20 that have it, and are genuine; for, says he, *did such an English Book appear, as he has been challenging us to produce, it would be no proof at all, that the imprinted Book, ratify'd by Parliament, had the clause in it.* Would it not at least be as good a proof of that, as his Edition of that Year without the clause is, that it was wanting in that Copy, to which the Parliament of that Year referr'd? And yet that in his very next words, is not only call'd *sufficient Evidence* on his side, but alledg'd to overthrow this of ours, which according to his own argument must be equally sufficient. For to argue in his words, *if the imprinted Book ratify'd by Parliament, was a Book, Printed 1571, by Jugge and Cawood, nothing can be plainer, than that the clause of the Church's power was ratify'd by Parliament, if I have that very Edition with the Clause.* However I hope, if such an English Copy now appear,

appear, it will at least vindicate Bp. Pearson from this Gentleman's unmannerly Reflection. Therefore to do justice to the memory of that great Man, and to put our Libeller out of his pain at once, I can assure him from my own knowledge, that there are still extant several Copies of the Articles with the contested Clause in them, printed by Richard Fugge and John Cawood in that very Year 1571. Nay, that there are several Editions of them still in being, notwithstanding all the pains this Gentleman and his Friends have probably taken to suppress them (in order to wipe off the scandal of this Popish Clause from their most excellent and pure Church;) and their egregious Confidence, that they had done it effectually.

And because it is not to be expected, that the Author of *Priestcraft in Perfection* should believe any thing upon the bare word of a Priest; or that he should refrain from giving me the Lye in the most outrageous manner, if I told him I my self had seen several of these Copies, since he falls so inhumanly upon Bp. Pearson, for asserting only that he had seen and collated one of them: I do hereby engage and promise, that one of these Copies shall be left for his perusal at the Bookseller's for whom this Vindication is printed; and if that does not satisfy him, I shall be ready to produce three different Impressions of that Year, all containing the Clause in question, and all printed by Fugge and Cawood, which is likewise a confirmation of what Bp. Pearson farther says of the Articles

And Bishop Pearson vindicated from his unmannerly Reflection by several English Copies of the Year 1571, with the Clause, still extant.

Nay by three different Editions of that Year, with it, all ready to be produced for this Gentleman's satisfaction.

Which also justifies that Prelate's account of two of those Editions.

print-

printed that Year. *The Articles*, says he, were again ratify'd and confirm'd in the Year 1571, as appears by 2 English Editions, both for forth the same Year by Richard Jugge, and John Cawood. And 'tis likely he meant those genuine Editions that have the Clause, since he takes no notice of any that want it. I wish therefore, since Bp. Pearson in the Passage our Author quotes from him, only speaks of one of these Editions, and of one single Copy, that a Gentleman of so much distinction as our Author, had thought fit (where no more than a clause of an Article is concern'd) to have shew'd less anger against that great Man, who has establish'd all the Articles of the Christian Faith upon an inviolable Foundation, and defended them with invincible strength of Reason: And that he would have had some veneration for the memory of a Prelate of that Church, which he calls his own, and who, as far as Christian Hope can assure us, is now enjoying the Reward of those blessed Labours, which as every sincere Member of Christ's Church must highly esteem, so the Spirit of Atheism only and Infidelity can never forgive.

Who should therefore have been treated with more humanity, by a Gentleman, that pretends to be of the same Church.

His Argument But our Author has another Argument to prove, that the controverted Clause was never ratify'd, as he calls it, by Parliament; and that is taken * from the several printed Editions of the Articles in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth. He begins with his English one of the Year 1571 mention'd above, and a Latin one of the same Year printed by John

* No Neces. of Reform. ubi sup. p. 357. * Pr. Cr. p. 18. Day,

Day, both of them without the Clause; and proves, that that Clause was omitted, both in the English and Latin Edition of that Year,^h from the concession of Archbishop *Laud*, and of his Chaplain *Dr. Heylin*; and he might have added, from that of all Men living, who have look'd into this matter; If he only mean, that this Clause was omitted in an English and a Latin Edition that Year, that is in a spurious Edition both English and Latin; for the genuine Editions in both Languages, even in the Year 1571, had the contested Clause in them, as I have already shew'd of the English, and shall now of the Latin; for since this Gentleman owns, not onlyⁱ that *Bishop Pearson's* evidence is most full and expressive in behalf of the English Edition that Year, printed by *Richard Fugge* and *John Cawood*; but that *Bishop Sparrow*^k in his Collection of Articles^l, &c. has given us a Copy of a Latin Edition that same Year, printed by *John Day*, which also contains the contested Clause; and farther, that my Lord of *Sarum* has publish'd a Copy of the same Latin Edition with the Clause of the Church's Power in it: This, one would think should be sufficient to convince any reasonable Man, that there was not only an English, but a Latin Edition of the Articles in the Year 1571, with the controverted Clause in them, whatever may appear now to the contrary; and that all we can argue from Editions of

The contested Clause was not omitted in the genuine Editions of 1571, neither English, nor Latin.

All that can be argued from Copies of that Year without the Clause, is, that some of that Year wanted, as well as others had it.

^h *Ibid.* p. 21. ⁱ *Ibid.* p. 16. ^k *Ibid.* p. 18. ^l *Edit.* that Year wanted, as well as others had it.

1671. p. 207. * *Pr. Cr. ibid.*

B. Sparrow says that Day's Edition of 1571 had the Clause, and is on that account used little better, than Bishop Pearson, by our Author.

Why he shews more respect to Bishop Burnet, who says the same thing.

that Year without the Clause, tho' under the same Printers Names, is, That the Articles were printed that Year in English and Latin without the Clause, as well as with it. But all this evidence of such Editions with the Clause in the Year 1571, instead of convincing the Judgment of our *Libeller*, only provokes his Anger, and be the Persons that bear the least Testimony against him, of never so high Rank, or so great Integrity, all they say is of no credit with this Gentleman, but their Evidence all *Priestcraft* and *Prevarication*. We have seen with what good breeding he treats Bishop Pearson upon this account, and his usage of another Prelate, the learned *Collector of the Articles*, &c. above-mention'd, is pretty much of the same strain: His Words are these, "And yet Bishop Sparrow has the Assurance to pretend to give us a Latin Copy of the Articles, under the title of Articles, &c. printed by John Day, in 1571, wherein he has inserted the Clause of the Church's Power, contrary to John Day's own Edition. He speaks indeed with more respect of Bishop Burnet, because it seems it was from the Discoveries of old MSS. made by that Bishop, that he had the first hint of the Forgery of this Clause. But as much as he applauds his Lordship's Ingenuity in this Affair, if he does not at the same time equally reflect upon his Integrity, in quoting him in direct Contradiction to that Copy of John Day's, printed before his Exposition of the Articles, yet at least he char-

^m Pr. Cr. p. 18. ⁿ Ibid.

ges him with such a Neglect, in leaving a matter of this importance to others, as if true, would be of far more Dishonour to his Lordship, than to be accused even of Forgery by such a *Libeller*. I hope he will think himself oblig'd, in Justice to his Character, as well as to himself, and especially to the Clause in question, which he has thus unhappily given occasion to dispute afresh, to vindicate his Copy of *Day's* Edition of the

And why that Bishop ought to vindicate both that Edition, and himself, and the contested Clause.

Articles. In the mean time I have one farther Evidence of the truth of that Copy, besides his and *Bishop Sparrow's*, and that is another learned *Bishop's*, who was very far from what this Gentleman calls a *High-Churchman*. I mean the late Bishop of *Lincoln*, *Dr. Barlow*; and his Testimony in this matter is also of more weight, because it seems to be given only between God and his own Conscience, without any design to make it publick, and consequently without any possible Reason to induce him to say, what he did not certainly know to be most exactly true; for we find it in his private Notes, written with his own Hand, in an English Book of Articles of the Year 1633, now extant among that Bishop's Books in the *Bodleian Library*. Most of these Notes or Observations are put down in some spare Leaves at the beginning of the Book, under the Title of *Ἀνὰ δὲ ἑκείνη, seu Adversaria de Articulis Ecclesiae Anglicanae subsequentibus, & praecipue de Articulo xx.* the rest, in the Margin over against the 20th Article; which shews they were only private Observations,

Another Testimony, that that Edition had the Clause, and that another Bishop's, who was none of our Author's High-Church-men.

such as learned Men often set down in the Margins of their Books, without any intent of publishing them; and yet in those Observations before the Book, he says most expressly, *that the Latin Copy of the Articles of 1562, printed at London by John Day 1571, has those words:—Habet Ecclesie Ritus sive Cereemonias statuendi jus, & in fidei controversiis auctoritatem*: And among the Editions referr'd to in the Margin, which contain'd that Clause, he again sets down this Edition thus: *Lat. A. 1571. Not contented to have done this, when he comes to the 20th Article, he there again proves the Authority of this Clause from this very Edition; as the Articles were printed, says he, at London, by John Day 1571, and the Words (he is speaking of this Clause) out in Edward 6th's Articles, are in as here.* So that we have here the Testimony of a Bishop, who was thought none of the best Friends, either to the Church, or to the Power asserted in this Clause, not only in favour of the Clause it self, (for he expressly asserts in these Notes, that *among the Additions made to King Edward's Articles in the Year 1562, were these words, of our 20th Article, which was his 21st, and that yet this Clause is (malâ fide & nonnullorum fraude) left out in some Editions since.*) But we have his Testimony likewise to the Authority of Day's Edition of 1571, with the Clause in it, and that repeated once and again within the compass of these short Notes: And I hope with our Authors good leave, this may

may as properly be call'd *John Day's own Edition*, as the other.

The next Edition our *Libeller* quotes *, is *Day's Edition* another Latin one of *Day's* in the Year 1579, of 1575, and also without the Clause; and we do not deny, that there is such an Edition of *Day's* in that Year, as well as in 1571; but we affirm, that they are neither of them genuine, but that both these and all other Editions, which have not the contested Clause in them, are spurious and false Copies of the Articles, procur'd, as *Abp. Laud* says, or at least supported by the malicious Canning of the opposite Faction. And there need no other Proof of this, than what has been alledg'd above, to shew, that this Clause was most undoubtedly added to the Articles by the Convocation of 1562, and pass'd again in that of 1571, and was also contain'd in the imprinted Book refer'd to by the Act of Parliament of the 13th of *Q. Elizabeth*, which enjoins Subscription to the Articles. After which, all that can be argued from these ancient Editions without the Clause, is only that the Church had Enemies so long since, who even from the beginning of *Queen Elizabeth's* Reign, were sowing those Tares, which grew up so plentifully in *King Charles* the first's time, and a second Harvest of which affords now so dismal a Prospect, that it is the study of our best Divines, and the Care of the Legislature it self, to prevent the farther growth of it.

What is the most, that can be argued from them.

* *Pr. Cr.* p. 20,

Archbishop
Laud does not
say, that the
Clause was o-
mitted after
1571, for 22
Years.

How long it was after 1571, before the Clause was put into the printed Copies (his Author says was again put in) this Gentleman it seems †, cannot find out, any more than my Lord of Sarum *. But he is willing to think, from Archbishop Laud's, and Dr. Heylin's Account of this matter, that it was not till the Year 1593; and then triumphs in this pretended Evidence of the omission of this Clause, *not only in the Year wherein the Articles were ratify'd, says he ||, by Law, but for 22 Years afterwards*: And yet notwithstanding his mighty Notoriety of Fact, 'tis most certain this, Fact was notoriously otherwise; and as Archbishop Laud is without Reason brought as an Evidence, that this Clause continued to be left out of the printed Copies for so many Years: So his Chaplain's Mistake in this matter was wholly owing to the same Mis-construction of the Archbishop's Words, in which our Critick is so ready to follow him: For Archbishop Laud, as I have observ'd † above, by the four Editions which he mentions, had no Design to give us, as this Gentleman would † understand, a compleat List of the printed Editions of the Articles, but only † out of his own Store, those few printed Copies which he had by him, to shew the Boldness and the Falshood of those ancient Libellers, in whose Steps our modern One so zealously treads, that he is not ashamed to argue from this,

† Ibid. ° Exp. p. 16. † Sup. p. 21. * Pr. Cr. p. 20.
* Speech in the Star-Chamb. || Ibid. p. 21.

as a compleat List, though, as I shall presently shew, he must have known of several Editions within that time, that had the Clause in them, and are still extant; unless his Oxford Friend was very unfaithful to him in his Account from thence. Though therefore the earliest Edition mentioned by Archbishop Land, next to Renald Wolfe's of 1563, was that of 1593; yet neither this, nor the Death of the Earl of Leicester about this time, who had most probably encouraged the omission of the Clause, was a sufficient Reason for Dr. Heylin's affirming that it was not again reprinted till that Year: For we have all the Evidence in the World to the contrary, and more than our Discoverer is able to produce for its having been omitted at all. Indeed all the Proof he can bring, that the Clause was left out of the printed Copies, during four or five of those 22 Years (for his Evidence extends no farther) is only a few printed Copies without the Clause, still extant: And we have all that Proof, and more, (for there are abundantly more Copies still extant to shew) that the contested Clause was printed with the rest of the Articles from time to time, not only during that space of 22 Years, but as far backward as since the first passing of the Articles in the Convocation of 1562, and ever since, down to this very Day. And yet there is more reason for a present Scarcity of ancient Editions with the Clause, than of those without it: For these latter, tho' printed in less

*This is wrongly
inferred from
what he says,
both by Dr.
Heylin, and
our Author, and
by the latter, in
all probability
against his own
Knowledge.*

*His Evidence
extends but to
4 or 5 of those
22 Years.
That against
him is greater,
both for those
22 Years, and
all before, and
since; tho' there
is more reason
for a present
scarcity of an-
cient Editions
with the Clause,
than of those
without it.*

Hist. of Presb. p. 268.

number, yet probably were never very publick, but came abroad as it were by stealth; and consequently lighting into fewer hands, would be less liable to be destroy'd: Besides, that they would be preserv'd on account of this Particularity, of omitting the Clause: Whereas the others having nothing particular in them, every new Edition of them would naturally supersede the old one; and when at last they came to be collected into a Volume, together with Injunctions, Canons, &c. by Bishop Sparrow, all the former Impressions would be apt to be neglected, as loose Papers; and indeed while loose, would not be so easily preserv'd: And if a few, that had escap'd the common Ruin, came at last to be valued for their Antiquity, they would be in danger to fall a Sacrifice to the Zeal of the Faction, who having once form'd an Argument against the Church's Authority from those ancient Editions of the Articles that wanted the Clause, would, to make that Argument good, hardly scruple to remove out of their way, a few old Copies that had it; however we have still more of these left. And this I have partly made appear already, in answer to this Gentleman's last Argument, to 'prove, that *the imprinted Book of Articles, ratify'd* (as he is resolv'd to call it) *by Parliament, was without the Clause*; and shall have occasion to shew farther now in defence of what he observes " has been urg'd in behalf of the Clause, from some ancient printed Copies.

¹ *Pr. Cr.* p. 21. ² *Ibid.* p. 22.

For his next attempt is by way of Objection to that which is urg'd, says he, in behalf of the Clause; and that he would have the World think, is nothing but a few ancient printed Copies, whereas I have shew'd him above, that Archbishop Laud alledg'd these, not so much in Confutation of the Forgery in general, as of its being committed by him, and the Prelates of that time; and that he prov'd the Authority of the Clause, beyond all Contradiction, from the very original Record it self. However, in considering what our Adversary says here, I shall have occasion to mention all the other printed Copies, in which the disputed Clause is found, and the first of them is most likely (as was observ'd above) the very first Impression of the Articles after they pass'd the Convocation of 1562. I mean the Latin one of the Year 1563, by *Renald Wolfe*, the Queen's Printer in Latin, probably wrought off as soon as the Articles were pass'd; for as that happen'd but a few Months before the Year 1563 began, according to the Computation of the Church of England, so in the account of the Printers, who begin the Year from *Michaelmas-Term*, the Articles were pass'd, as well as printed in 1563. He observes, * that this Edition was appeal'd to by Archbishop *Laud*; and adds, that my Lord of *Sarum* speaks of one Copy printed in that Year. My Lord of *Sarum* says nothing, whether there were one or more Impressions: He only says †, and that very positively, *that*

His Objections against what is urg'd in behalf of the Clause, which he would persuade us, is only a few antient printed Copies.

That printed by Renald Wolfe, A°. 1563, probably the first Impression, and wrought off as soon as the Articles were pass'd.

My Lord of Sarum does not say, whether there was one, or more Impressions of that

* Pr. Cr. p. 22. † Speech in the Star-Chamb.
pos. p. 16.

‡ Ex. Year.
that

His Lordship might have told us, there was one in the same Library with the Cambridge MSS.

There are two in the Bodleian Library.

Our Author argues against Bp. Burnet, on occasion of this Edition; and yet makes him partly of his own side.

that the Articles were first printed in the Year 1563, conform to the present Impressions, which are still in use among us. But our Libeller chose to call this speaking of one Copy of that Year, I suppose in opposition to what he immediately subjoins from Dr. Heylin, who speaks of two. However, the same Ingenuity that prevail'd with his Lordship of Sarum to give an account of the *Corpus Christi* MSS. (for which the Author of *Priestcraft* speaks so well of this Bishop, having made so many useful Discoveries from them) might have persuaded him to tell us, that there was one of these Latin Copies of 1563. with the Clause, in the very same Library with those MSS. They have also two Copies of this Edition in the publick Library at Oxford, of which, that among Mr. Selden's Books has a Label, as we have observ'd, tack'd to it, with the original Subscription of the Lower House of Convocation, A° 1571. And what has our Author to say against the Credit of this Edition? He spends several Pages in arguing against Bishop Burnet upon this occasion; and yet represents him, as allowing, that the insertion of the Clause into this Copy, was an Alteration made from the original MS; and only pleading, that there could be no Fraud nor Artifice in it, when the thing was then fresh and well known. A very good Plea, as I don't doubt to shew, and that in the Case before us; but our Author has so little reason for confining it to this Case, that it does not certainly appear to have been made with the least Eye to it; for as bold as he is pleas'd to make with the Passage he cites,

cites, and according to his usual Ingenuity, change one number for another, to pervert it to his Purpose; and as well as he thinks he understands it, I must own it is not so easie to me: For what *Alterations* the Bishop there ^a means I do not know, unless they be all those Variations between the MS. and the Print, which he had been shewing in the Collation: Since he speaks there of more than one, and as if they had been all such, as have no relation to the Point in question; he comes afterwards to this of the Clause, which he calls an *Alteration of more importance*, and says it was made (not in the Year 1563, which is that our Discoverer of Frauds is speaking of, viz. of the Insertion of the contested Clause in the Latin Edition of that Year; but) in the Year 1571, and that not by *inserting*, but *leaving out* that Clause, *both in the Manuscripts*, says he, *and in the printed Editions*. And yet we know of but one MS. of that Year, and the account which the Bishop had of that, as I observ'd above, shon'd have rather induc'd his Lordship to say, that the Clause was *not* left out of the MS. of that Year. I hope his Lordship will think himself oblig'd to defend both himself and the Clause against the Objections of this bold Writer; and then he will have an opportunity of explaining himself, and likewise of acquainting us, what Editions of the Articles those were, which he sent down to be collated with the *Bennet College MSS* a Point not

It is uncertain what Alterations the Bishop means, to have been made from the original MS.

^a *Expos.* p. 16.

Whate'er he means, his Argument may be made good against our Author.

The Clause could not have been foisted into this first Edition of the Articles, if they had so lately pass'd without it, and no notice be taken of it.

This is the very Argument us'd by one of his own Authors, to vindicate the Faction from raising the Clause; but is much stronger on our side.

easily known, and yet necessary to render those Collations intelligible. In the mean time, as I have sufficiently shew'd above, that there is no such Alteration from the original MS. in this Edition of 1563, so I think the Bishop's Argument, if I understand it, whatever Alterations he argues about, is a very good proof of this, viz. since there was no Objection of that Nature made at that time, it is all one to me, whether it had been by Papists, or Protestants. And is it probable, either that any one would have the assurance to publish the Articles as soon as they were pass'd, with so considerable an Alteration from the Original; or that so bare-faced a Fraud could have escaped the notice of all Mankind, when the thing, as the Bishop observes, was fresh and well known, and no one Person of that stupid Age, as our great Judge of Learning represents it, have penetration enough to discover a palpable Cheat at the time it was acting, which this sagacious Inquirer at near 150 Years distance has so easily detected? This is the very Argument, which one of this Gentleman's Authors uses^b to prove, that the controverted Clause was not rais'd by the Faction. He pretends that there was an Edition of the Articles without the Clause, printed the same Year in which they were first agreed upon: And is it a thing likely, says he, that so soon after the Convocation, Puritans durst or would do such a thing, and pass so quietly away with it, and without

^b Hamilton's some Neces. of Reform. p. 14.

noise made by the Bishops, as that diversity of Copies was pass'd over, if the Bishops had not made the diversity themselves, to their own Advantage, or some of theirs for them, by their Privilege and Allowance? But this Argument is much stronger against the pretended Interpolation of the Clause; as much stronger, as it is more certain, that there was an Impression of the Articles that Year, in which the Clause was printed, than that there was one, wherein it was omitted; and that is as much more, as we can well imagine: For whereas we have only Mr. Hamilton's bare word for it, that there was an Edition of that early date without the Clause; it is agreed on all hands, that there was one with it, and we have several Copies of it still extant. It also renders the Argument yet stronger on our side, that leaving out a Clause was much less liable to Observation, or Objection, than putting one in. Our Author was probably aware of this, and therefore though his whole Book be mostly compos'd of what he has borrow'd from that Gentleman and others, yet he neglects this Argument against the Clause, at the same time, that he cites the Passages, which immediately both precede and follow it. But if neither his Author had us'd this Argument against the Clause, nor he himself been sensible of the force of it on our side, and therefore wisely suppress'd it, yet all the World must own, that as far as a negative Argument can prove, it is a Proof that the Latin Edition of 1563 is genuine, and a true Copy of the original Articles; and

*And therefore
is wisely suppress'd
by our
Author.*

con-

That nothing of this Nature was then objected, appears from our Author's own observation of the silence of the Writers of that Age, concerning this question.

This silence no Argument of their ignorance, or negligence; but only, that the question was not yet mov'd.

Who may be most properly charg'd with expunging the Clause.

consequently that the contested Clause was not fraudulently inserted into it, because there was no objection made when the thing was fresh. And that there was not the least Fraud of this Nature objected at that time, appears from *the silence of the writers of that Age, concerning the Authority of this Clause*, which our Adversary owns, and would make it an Argument, *either of the ignorance or negligence of Queen Elizabeth's time*: Whereas it only proves, that this Question was not then mov'd: For tho' there were some Copies printed in that Reign without the Clause, yet that might be done, as I said above of Dr. *Mocker's* Book, without disputing the Authority of it, but only to please a Party, that lik'd the Article better as it stood in King *Edward's* time, than as it was alter'd by the Addition of this Clause in Queen *Elizabeth's*; and tho' I do not by any means justify that omission in those early days, yet it is not upon those first Printers of the Articles without the Clause, who did not, as far as it appears, either undertake to justify that Omission, or pretend the Clause was of no Authority; but upon our *Libeller* and his Predecessors, who from that Omission pretend to prove the Clause to be a Forgery, that I would lay the Crime of raising and expunging the Clause. The former may be rather said to have delay'd the Admission into the Articles, than to have turn'd it out of them; which is chiefly done by those, who not only justi-

fy leaving it out, but from thence argue, that it has no right to be in. Till the party carried things to this height, and being flush'd with Success could no longer distinguish between Connivance and Authority (just as at present they are for erecting Toleration into *Establishment*) it was not thought worth while to take notice of this omission in a few Copies; much less to undertake the vindication of the now contested Clause, when as yet we do not find it's Authority was at all question'd: for which reason the first Censure we meet with on this occasion is that of Dr. *Mocker's* Book above-mention'd; if after all, his omitting of this Clause was the true reason of burning his Book, for which we have seen there were so many others. Now from this silence in a question not yet mov'd, to argue the ignorance or negligence of that time, is as unreasonable, as to make the same inference concerning that Age and all since down to our own, from no Author's, as far as I know, having in opposition to the Papists, who leave the Second Commandment out of the Decalogue, taken upon him to prove, that that Commandment is of equal Authority with all the rest. It is time enough to do this, when they, like this Gentleman and his Party, have the assurance to charge us with foisting it in, only because they themselves have left it out. And in like manner the Writers of *Queen Elizabeth's Reign* could not but think it time enough to break that silence they are accused of, concerning the Authority of the Clause

now

Till omitting it was made an Argument against its Authority, there was no need of vindicating it.

That the question was not yet moved, also appears from the silence of the opposite party.

now in dispute, when any controversy should arise about it. The Church has in all Ages had too much opposition, to need anticipate any before it comes, still sufficient for the Day has been the evil thereof, and she was so exercised with these evils in those Days, what with the Papists on the one hand, and the Puritans on the other, that she had no leisure for questions not yet mov'd, as (to turn our Author's Argument upon him) 'tis evident this was not, also from the silence of the opposite party. If this Question had been then mov'd, would Cartwright have said nothing upon it? Would not he have objected the foisting of this Clause into the Article, if it had been done at that time? And would not that have been objected against the Articles by some of those that refus'd to subscribe them? One of those Learned Gentlemen above-mention'd, to whom I was oblig'd for a very careful Examination, and a most exact Account of the *Corpus Christi* MSS, and who is very well vers'd in all the particular History and Writings of that Age, both in MS and Print, assures me, that he has seen many of the Pamphlets of Queen Elizabeth's Reign, and never met with any objection to the Authority of this Clause; nay and tells me of one Entituled, *A Brief Answer — also certain Reasons against Subscription to the Book of Articles*, said to be written about the Year 1583, in which the Author objects to the 6th, 7th, 16th, 21st, 33d, 35th, and 36th Articles, and yet says nothing against the 20th. And in the Conference

ference at *Hampton-Court*, in the beginning of the next Reign, tho' there were exceptions made * to several of the Articles, there was not one word said against this. Instead therefore of this printed Copy of 1563 *containing the Original* subscribed by the Convocation just before, it is an Argument against the Authority of that pretended Original of 1562, and that the Original Record of the Articles passed in that Convocation had the Clause of the Church's Power in it, as *Arch-bishop Laud* also demonstrated by an Authentick Copy of the 29th Article with that Clause in it, taken from that Original. If this be not a sufficient Defence of what my Lord of *Sarum* says in this particular, yet it abundantly makes good all the Argument that I presume to borrow from him; and I am no farther concern'd in the vindication of my Lord of *Sarum*.

Therefore this Edition of 1563 does not contradict the Original Articles, but proves that the MS. of 1562 is no Authentick Original.

But I must not pass over a very Learned Remark of our *Critick's* †, whereby he would shew the ignorance and Stupidity of that Age, wherein he pretends this Forgery was first committed; and that is taken from Mr. *Strype's* Account * of the bad hands of many of the Subscribers of the Lower House of the Convocation of 1562. If this Argument be good, I doubt no Age will be proof against it, at least not the Learned Men of any Age, who generally so spoil their Hands with much and fast writing, that to write like a Scholar is become almost a Proverb for expressing a very ill

Bad hands an ill proof of the ignorance of any Age.

* Barlow's *Sum. and Subst. of the Confe.* p. 24: 25.

† *Priest-Craft* p. 24. * *Annals* p. 291.

As Bishop Burnet could have told him.

As well as his other Author, who helps him to the Argument.

Hand. For our own Age I need only refer this Gentleman to the Printers, who are full of Complaints upon this Topick; and as to the time of the Reformation, I hope he does not question the Learning of the great Reformer *Luther*; and yet Bishop *Burnet*, to whom he has been oblig'd for so many other discoveries, could have also inform'd ^c him, that *Luther* wrote so bad a Hand, that his Lordship, tho' *practis'd* ^a in reading the Hands of that Age, yet was not able to transcribe a Letter of his, without making such mistakes, as some think the worst Hand in the World can hardly account for. And this Gentleman's other Author *Mr. Strype*, who furnishes him with this judicious Remark of the ill Hands of those Subscribers, and probably in those words (*whatever their Learning was*) with which he prefaces the account of their bad writing, gave a handle to the wise Argument, he draws from thence, even he (if our Author had been us'd to read Books through) would have acquainted him ^a in the Conclusion of his *Annals*, and that from the Testimony of one of the Learned Writers ^b of that Age, that *there never was a time, wherein our Churches were better furnished with Wise, Learned, and godly men, than they were at that day*: Nor consequently, wherein this pretended Forgery was either less likely to be attempted, or less capable of being conceal'd. I will add one modern

^c *Vindic.* p. 80. ^a *Ibid.* ^b *Annals* p. 591. ^d *Whitgift against the Admonition An. 1572.* p. 206.

Instance : his great Hero Mr. Bayle, as I suppose our Author well knows, wrote a very bad hand, yet he is one of those transcendent Writers, in whose praises this Gentleman is always declaiming. Now will he frankly confess, that a great Scholar may write a bad hand, or number Mr. Bayle amongst the unlearned and ignorant; I wish for his own Sake he would do the latter, and that we may hear no more of his *Encomiums* upon those Atheistical Tenets, which he is pleas'd with great care to select and publish from that Author, and cry him up for defending them with his last Breath, in however bad a hand they were written.

His great Hero Mr. Bayle wrote a very bad hand.

His next Proof of the ignorance of that Age, from an injunction¹ to all Ministers, &c. to read the publick Service *leisurely, plainly, and distinctly*, &c. is equally defective. I know not whether there may not be too much occasion for such an Injunction even at this time, in which I am confident our Author will own, there is as much Learning as ever among the Ecclesiasticks; and himself is so great an Instance of penetration and sagacity in the Laity, such as no fraud or artifice can impose upon, that I need not trouble my self to produce any others; and yet he cannot but know, that among the Church-men at that time, there were several *unpreaching Ministers*, whose chief Business it was to read the *publick Prayers, Chapters, and Homilies*; and whose Qualifications might not be much su-

His next Proof from an Injunction to read the publick Service leisurely, is equally defective,

¹ Priest-Craft p. 24.

perious to that Employment, as those of some of our *Petty-Canons* at this day; and that it was no reflection upon the Learning of that Age, that some of those were such *mean Readers*, that it was fit to injoin them to *peruse the Chapters, &c.* before-hand; for that part of the Injunction relates ^k expressly to such, tho' our Author is pleas'd to suppress that particular, and referr this also to *all Ministers, &c.* according to his usual way of citation. He takes this Argument from *Dr. Langbain* ^l, as well as the next, for which he quotes ^m him; and as he extends thro' all that long Reign, what the Dr. confines to the very beginning of it; so neither is this Argument of the Doctor's, any more than the last, conclusive even as to the beginning of that Reign; for the scarcity ⁿ of Preachers at that time, proceeded from the want, not so much of Learned Men, as of such, who had not by their compliance in the preceding Reign, given any jealousy of their Inclination to Popery; for in the infancy of the Reformation the chief care was to prevent a relapse; and for that reason the Church was contented with a few able Preachers, assisted by Readers, that were known to be of sound Principles, tho' illiterate; rather than to commit the care of Souls to Men of more learning, when there was the least suspi-

^k *Sparrow's Collect.* p. 82. *And such as are but mean Readers shall peruse, &c.* ^l *Pref. to the true Subject to the Rebell.* ^m *Priest-Craft* p. 24. ⁿ *Vide Strype's Annals ubi sup. and Bridge's Defence of the Government establish'd in the Church, &c. Book 6. p. 408, &c.*

cion of their Faith. And yet his instance of *rare preaching*, as ridiculous as it now appears, and one would think should have always done to Men of Judgment, is rather a proof of the false Rhetorick, than of the ignorance of that time: At least it was no great Argument of their ignorance, that a High Sheriff was but an indifferent Preacher. But *there was less liberty and freedom of thinking* in that Age, fewer Books, he means, that deserv'd to be burnt by the common hangman, and if all the learning of our Age be in the *Freethinkers*, I cannot but imagine, that it would be much happier, both for our Church and Constitution, that ours were as ignorant and stupid as Queen *Elizabeth's*.

But besides the pretended ignorance and stupidity of that Age, our Discoverer has found out something else to facilitate the Forgery and Imposition of the contested Clause at that time, and that is a very notable Supposition of his, that besides the *Latin* Edition of the Articles printed A°. 1562, with the Clause, there was at the same time publish'd an Edition in *English* without the Clause. By this, (if I guess his meaning) he would insinuate, that the pretended Forgery was first made in the *Latin* Edition, which being less understood, it would be therefore less taken notice of; and that at the same time the *English* Articles, which every body could read, were suffer'd to go about as yet uncorrupted. But if our *Libeller* knows any thing, he must needs know, that the Articles of 1562 were pass'd in *Latin*; and that as that was cer-

His Supposition of an English Addition without the Clause, as early as this Latin one with it, would not have facilitated the pretended Forgery,

tainly the reason, why this first Impression of them was in that Language; and not what he would silyly insinuate, that the Clause might be thereby foisted in, and less notice taken of it: So this Corruption in a Copy just printed from the Original, and in the same Language, must needs be more conspicuous, than if it had been in any other Language, tho' never so much understood; for all that understood *Latin*, and would compare this Copy with the Original, must at first sight discover the Interpolation; which would not have been so visible in a different Language, in which the sense and meaning was to be first compared, as well as the words: And it is to be hoped, that even in that *ignorant Age* the Clergy, who were the Persons concern'd to read and subscribe these Articles, did generally at least understand *Latin*; and they that did not understand *Latin*, were not able to compare the *Englisb* with the Original, nor therefore to detect any Fraud that might have been committed in a corrupt Copy or Translation of it. So that our Author does here argue rather against himself; and the Clause was so far from being added in the *Latin* Edition of 1563, to the end that this pretended first Insertion of it might be taken the less notice of in that unknown Tongue; that if there were any Edition of that Year without the Clause, it was most probably first omitted in that Language, because the Fraud was not so liable to be discovered in that, as in the *Latin*. But how does this
Gen-

Such an Edition, if there had been any, would rather have facilitated the rasure of the Clause.

Gentleman know, that there was an *English* Edition of that Year without the contested Clause? He is willing to think there was none in *English* with the Clause of that date; and yet he had more reason to think, there was an *English* one that Year with, than without the Clause; he knew there was more evidence of this, than of the other: For he owns^a that Dr. Heylin says, that there was an Edition in *English* of that Year, which had the Clause; and the Dr. is most express^o, not only *that the Clause was extant in the Registers of the Convocation, as part of the 20th Article; but that it was printed as a part thereof both in Latin and English, A° 1562; and 'tis possible they might be printed even in that Year, before the Year 1563 began; tho' according to the Printers Custom above-mention'd, the English as well as the Latin should have bore date, A° 1563. Yet in the Journals of Parliament A° 1566, we have an Edition of the Articles mention'd^p under the name of a little Book printed in the Year 1562, for the sound Christian Religion, brought in with the Bill for the Articles of Religion; as the same Bill is call'd^q in the Journal, at its passing the House upon the 3d Reading, and when it was sent up to the Lords, which at the first and second Reading is intituled, The Bill with a little Book printed, &c. as above; and for a farther explanation the Journal at each reading of it refers to the 13th of Elizabeth, when the Act relating to these*

Yet he knows there is more evidence of an English Edition on of 1563 with the Clause, than of one without it.

He owns Dr. Heylin's Testimony is express in this Case.

And it seems confirmed by the Journals of Parliament, even as to the very date.

^a *Press-Craft* p. 22. 26. ^o *Hist. of Presbyter* p. 248

^p *Sir Simon D'Ewes Journ.* p. 132. ^q *Ibid.* p. 133.

Articles pass'd; for it seems this *Bill with a little Book*, &c. was dropt in the House of Lords, in that former Parliament. Which Account as it seems to justify that of Dr. Heylin, even as to the very date of the Edition of the Articles, mention'd by him: So it is another Evidence, that there was such an early *Englisch* Edition; for if that *little Book* had been *Latin*, it would most probably have been taken notice of as such in the Journal; besides that the first *Latin* Impression of the Articles (as we have seen) bears date 1563. And since this *little Book* printed in the Year 1562, must in all likelihood have been the very same with that in Dr. Heylin, (it is most certain it is not that, which our Author pretends 'was the first *Englisch* Edition of the Articles; for no Man knows when that was printed) this is also another not improbable evidence, that the first *Englisch* Edition of the Articles had the affirmative Clause of the Church's Power in it, as Dr. Heylin says most expressly of that he mentions. And what says the Author of *Priest-Craft* against this Testimony of Dr. Heylin? He opposes 'another Testimony' against it, that of

Mr. Hamilton's
Testimony op-
pos'd to Dr.
Heylin's, tho'
not inconsistent
with his, or at
least of no more
Authority.

W. Hamilton, Gent; who affirms 'that there was a diversity of printed Copies, as to the Clause of the Church's Power, in the very Year the Articles were first agreed on: And again, that in that very Year there were two printed Editions of the Articles, one in En-

' *Priest-Craft* p. 27.
Necess. of Reform. p. 14.

' *Ibid.* p. 26.

' *Some*

glish and another in Latin, whereof the one had the Clause, and the other wanted it; and may not these Testimonies be both true? Might there not be such a Diversity even in the *Englisch* Editions of 1563, as we have seen there was both in the *Englisch* and *Latin* Copies of 1571? If these two Testimonies may be thus reconcil'd, why are they here set in opposition against each other? And if they cannot be reconcil'd, why is Mr. Hamilton's of more Credit, than Dr. Heylin's? Is it because he was a Layman, and therefore not to be suspected of Priest-Craft? He was one instance however, as he that quotes him is another, and I wish there were only these two Instances, that the Laity are not so ready, as is here pretended, to fight the Priests Battles. But if this Gentleman be not to be suspected of Priest-Craft, I am afraid his Testimony in this Matter may be liable to another Suspicion, that may equally endanger the credit of it, and that is, that it is grounded either upon some misinformation, or upon an Inference too hastily made from premises, that would not bear such a Conclusion; at least thus much is certain, that in the very same passage, where he speaks of this *Englisch* Edition of the Articles, he is guilty of a downright falshood, by making too hasty a conclusion concerning this very Edition: For he tells us there, that the Parliament of 1571 refers to an Edition of the Articles printed in the Year 1562; his

Nay of less; since he is guilty of a manifest falshood in the very passage in which he gives this Testimony, and concerning that Edition, which it is brought to support.

words are, *to a printed Book of Articles 1562, the same Year wherein they were agreed upon*; which as it can mean nothing but a Book printed that Year, so that it certainly means this does farther appear from what he is there arguing, *viz.* that there being two Editions of the Articles of the Year 1562, one with the contested Clause, and one without it, and the Parliament referring to one of them, without specifying which; it was doubtful whether it was that with the Clause or not, and consequently whether the Clause were confirmed by that Act. But 'tis certain from the Act * it self, as was observ'd above, that there is no mention in it, what Year the Book it refers to, was printed; which was therefore too hastily concluded, to have been the Year 1562, because the Act refers to a Book of Articles agreed upon that Year as the Title runs in all the *English* Editions; in which, and indeed wherever the Articles are mention'd, they are always call'd the Articles of 1562. Now a passage that has so palpable a mistake in it, cannot be look'd upon as a Testimony of any great Credit, especially concerning that Matter, that is the very Subject of the mistake. But since the *Libeller* has so much respect for this Gentleman's Testimony, I wish at least he had more for his Example; and would have learnt of him to treat an Author of Bishop *Pearson's* great worth in the Judgment of all good Men, tho' of a different Opinion from himself, with less opprobrious Language, than that of downright *Forgery and Falsification.* Mr. Hamilton

Our Author
that pays so
much respect to
his Testimony,
should shew
more for his
Example,
which wou'd
have taught
him to treat
Bishop *Pearson*
with more man-
ners.

* *Act. 13. Eliz. c. 12.*

writes professedly against that Prelate, but dedicates his Book to him in a very respectful manner, and as in his very Title Page he gives the Style of *Modest and Learned* to the Bishop's Book, against which he writes; so in his Dedication he treats the Author of it with the same good breeding; defends him against the Imputation of wilfully mistaking the meaning of those he argued against, which some of that Party with as little Charity as our Author laid to his Charge; and professes to have conceiv'd a *reverend Opinion of him* from his first Knowledge of him, and *to have found sufficient Cause since not to change it.* This was dealing with his Adversary as became a Gentleman, and a Christian: Whereas our Author's usage of this excellent Bishop, is wholly unbecoming both.

But to return to this Gentleman's Argument; to confirm Mr. *Hamilton's* account of this matter (which indeed wants Confirmation; for he himself offers no proof of it) he tells us from his *Oxford Correspondent*, to whom *he sent for a Collation of the first English Edition of the Articles, mention'd, says he, in the Oxford Catalogue, that he found indeed, that there had been an English Edition of the Year 1563, but that it had been entirely cut out of the Volume, in which it was bound up with other Miscellanies, as appears by the space that is there left.* This I confess is a sad Story, but why is it an Argument, that *that Edition of the Articles wanted the Clause?* Because, I suppose, none but the Priests could be guilty of so foul a Practice.

His account from Oxford in Confirmation of Mr. Hamilton's Testimony.

If an English Edition of the Articles of the Year 1563, had been cut out of a Volume in the Oxford Library, that does not prove that that Edition wanted the Clause.

*Instances, which
shew the Fa-
ction to be capa-
ble of such
Practices.*

Practice. The *Pure Sect* have been always so careful to preserve themselves unspotted from any Stain of this nature, that we must not imagine them capable of such a Corruption. Witness the foisting of Pamela's Prayer out of Sir Philip Sidney's *Arcadia*, into King Charles the first's *ΕΙΚΩΝ ΒΑΣΙΛΙΚΗ*, by the contrivance of Bradshaw and Milton, on purpose to discredit that excellent Book; and reprinting the whole Copy, to countenance the Forgery. A piece of Artifice, as our Author's Phrase is, so like this of raising the contested Clause, and procuring spurious Editions to give credit to the Cheat, and destroying them that are more genuine; that if there was any Copy of the Articles cut out of the Volume, it was most likely effected by the same Party, and for the same pious End. Or to give an Instance yet fresh in all Men's Memory, (for we seem to have forgot the *Saints Reign* from 41 to 60) witness *The shortest way with the Dissenters*, which all that Party gave out to be written by a Church of England Man, and to express the very Spirit of that persecuting Church, as it seems she was to be represented, when in a few Months, honest Daniel de Foe was found to be the true Author of it, and receiv'd upon the Pillory the Honour justly due to so meritorious a Work. These two Instances may suffice to persuade us, that the Faction, notwithstanding their fam'd Purity, are at least capable, when the service of the Cause requires it,

of some little Disingenuity, such as destroying an old Book of Articles, or the like. But after all, it may be our *Detector of Frauds* may have been misinform'd as to the Fact. The learned Gentleman above-mention'd, * (to whom I am indebted for a most perfect and exact Account of all the ancient Copies of Articles in the *Bodleian* Library, and for a most accurate Collation of them all, as far as concerns the Subject before us) says in his Letter already cited, " That the
 " Person he takes for our *Libeller's* Intelligence in this matter, made the same Observation to him; and shew'd him the
 " vacant Space, where he suppos'd this ancient Copy of the Articles had once been;
 " and because he told him such a Copy was referr'd to in the publick Catalogue, this
 " Gentleman for the present acquiesc'd in it; and tho' as soon as he had leisure to
 " look into the Catalogue, he plainly discover'd that the Year, when the Book in
 " the said Miscellany, to which the Catalogue directs, was printed, is not there
 " specify'd, yet he still concluded from the
 " Vacancy, that there had been a Copy of
 " the Articles cut out; till afterwards examining that, and the rest of their *Catalogues* more narrowly, he found that neither our Author nor his Friend had any
 " manner of Authority from their *Catalogues*, whether printed or written, to
 " assert, that there ever was in that Library a Copy of the first English Edition of

But there has been no such Edition cut out of any Volume in that Library.

* *Sup. p. 44.*

As appears
from all their
Catalogues.

If there had
been any, that
had been rather
a proof, that
the contested
Clause was con-
tain'd in that
Edition.

“ the Articles printed in the Year 1563.
 “ The Title, says he, in the Catalogues is
 “ this. *Articuli Religionis 39 in Synodo*
 “ *Londinensi, Anno 1562. Anglicè 4°. S. 77.*
 “ *Art. Seld.* without any hint when the
 “ Book was printed. This, continues he,
 “ was an over-sight in the Compilers of the
 “ Catalogue; for the Copy referr'd to, (which
 “ is only one) was printed by *Robert Bar-*
 “ *ker* in 1586. 'Tis there now to be seen;
 “ and that there never was but one Copy
 “ in that Volume, as long as it has been
 “ in the Library, is evident not only from
 “ all the Catalogues, says he, that we com-
 “ monly make use of, but from the very
 “ first Catalogue of *Mr. Selden's Books*, that
 “ was accurately drawn up by *Dr. Lockey's*
 “ own hand, which is preserv'd in a Study
 “ in the Gallery; and from the Books made
 “ use of by the *Curators* in their Annual
 “ Visitation of the Library. As therefore
 there is no grounds to believe, the Tract cut
 out of the Volume we are speaking of, to
 have been any Copy of the Articles, much
 less an English Copy of the Year 1563 with-
 out the contested Clause; so whatever that
 Tract was, it was evidently cut out before
 the Book came into the *Oxford Library*.
 And thus our Adversary's Argument for an
 English Edition of 1563 without the Clause,
 and this surmis'd Instance, of *Priest-craft*, on
 which he builds it, are both fallen to the
 Ground together; and yet if there had been
 an English Edition of the Articles of that
 Year cut out of the Volume referr'd to, I
 appeal to all sober Men, whether it had
 not

not been on the contrary more likely to have been effected by the *malicious Cunning of the Faction*, who, as appears from the Instances above, and a thousand others, stick at no means of attaining their glorious Ends of overturning all the Power and Authority both of Church and State: And whether therefore from so vile a Practice it would not have been more probably concluded, that that Edition of the Articles did contain the contested Clause of the Church's Power; and that as much *Artifice*, as may have been *us'd to give Credit to the controverted Clause*, and as much *Prevarication* as appears in supporting it, there has been neither *Artifice* nor *Prevarication* wanting on the other side, to undermine its Credit, and overthrow both the Clause it self, and the Authority asserted by it.

But our Enemy to *Priest-craft* has a farther Argument, that the English Edition of the Year 1563 wanted the Clause, and that is from an old Edition of *Jugge's* and *Ca-wood's* without the Clause, which tho' it bears no date, yet from its *answering all the Characters which Bishop Pearson gives of that first Edition in English*, and from its *reciting only the Titles of twenty Homilies*, agreeable to an Edition of the Homilies printed in 1563, he concludes to be the first Edition. It is very well Bp. Pearson is still in so much Credit with our *Libeller*, that he will venture to take the Characters of that first Edition from him: And what are

His old Edition without date is no proof, that the first English Edition wanted the Clause.

^a Pr. Cr. p. 39. ^b Ibid. p. 27.

It does not answer all the Characters, which Bishop Pearson gives of that first Edition.

those Characters? He says the first Edition was set forth by R. Jugge and J. Cawood, and that the Articles had no number affix'd to them. But are these all the Characters which Bp. Pearson gives of the first Impression? Does the Bishop say, that this Edition had no date neither? Does not he say, 'that the Articles were agreed upon in the Year 1562, and then printed with the very Title he had mention'd above, and that he had transcrib'd that Title out of that Edition? And is not that the Title of the English Edition, which he says^d was set forth by Richard Jugge and John Cawood? And to shew farther, that he did not speak of their English Edition of 1571, but of that in which he says^c, the Articles had no number affix'd to them (which our Author himself understands of the first English Edition) does not the Bishop both name this before even the Latin one of 1563, in the two Passages last cited, where he mentions both together, and also proceed distinctly to speak of Jugge's and Cawood's Edition of 1571, just after he had mention'd that of 1562 (as he seems to agree with Dr. Heylin, and the Journal of Parliament, concerning the date of this first English Impression) and does not he do this in two several Places, and speak even of two Editions of theirs of the Year 1571? From all which it is very evident, that the first English Edition of the Articles spoken of by Bishop Pearson, was not only set forth

^c No Necess. of Reform, ubi sup. p. 362. ^d Ibid. p. 357.
^e Ibid. p. 361.

by Jugge and Cawood, and no number affix'd to the Articles, the only Characters of that Impression, which this Gentleman is pleas'd to cite from the Bishop, because they only suit his purpose; but that it was dated, and probably the date was 1562; whereas the Edition which our Author would obtrude upon us, as the first, and indeed as the very Edition mean't by Bishop Pearson, has confessedly no date at all, and therefore does not answer all the Characters, that Bishop gives us of the first Edition of the Articles in English, however our Discoverer came to find the contrary; and by consequence is most certainly not that first Edition, with whatever Confidence he thinks^a, *be* which probably may assert that it is. May we not rather *was the same,* with some Confidence assert, that this Edition^b mention'd by Bishop Pearson is the same^c Dr. Heylin, and in the with that above, which Dr. Heylin and the Journals of Journals of Parliament speak of; and that^d Parliament. therefore the contested Clause was printed in it? Can it be otherwise imagin'd, that Bishop Pearson would have appeal'd to it? That an Author, who asserts^e that Clause *And likely* to have been part of the 20th Article, and *wou'd not have* takes no notice of any Edition that want- *been quoted by* ed it, but affirms^f in general, that the Ar- *the Bp. if it* ticles, as in our Modern Editions, were *had wanted the* the Clause. *same in Number, Nature, Substance, and* Words with those referr'd to in the Parli-
ament of 1571, which were^g the very Ar-
ticles of 1562, shou'd yet on any occasion

^a Priest-Craft p. 28. ^b No Necess. of Reform. p. 344.

^c Ibid. p. 383. ^d A.B. 13. Eliz. c. 12.

Nor would he
have appeal'd
to an Edition of
1571 in defence
of the Clause,
if he had known
one so much an-
cienter that
wanted it.

quote an Edition of them, that wanted that Clause, and would consequently have been at least a great prejudice against what he so positively affirms on his own Knowledge? Or can we imagine, that to prove there had been no Alterations in the Articles since they first pass'd, he would have alledged an Edition of 1571, if he had known of one so much elder as 1562, in which there was so considerable a difference, as the omission of that Clause, nay and have alledg'd it in the next line^{*}, after he had been speaking of that elder Edition? For tho' he there only undertakes to prove, that the Modern Editions contain'd the same Articles with those referr'd to by the Parliament of 1571, yet since he knew those were the very Articles of 1562, and the main Question was, whether those had been alter'd, his Proof had been both defective and disingenuous, if he had known of an Impression so much earlier, in which there had been such a Diversity. It will not be difficult for our *Accuser* to think him capable of this disingenuity, whom he charges with Crimes so much more heinous; But I believe most Men besides will rather imagine, that the Bishop had seen an Edition of *Jugge's* and *Camood's* printed in 1562, with the Clause, as well as in 1571, and that our Author's Old Edition without Numbers and Date, and without the Clause, tho' under those Printers Names, and tho' it could be prov'd to be of that Year, is

* No Necess. of Reform. p. 362.

no more an Argument, that the *English* Edition of 1562 wanted the Clause, than his Edition of 1571 without it is, any proof, that the Edition of that Year quoted by Bishop *Pearson* also wanted it. If that mention'd by Bishop *Pearson*, and this of our Adversary agree in some particulars, so do those of 1571, in which there is hardly any other difference, than that one has the Clause, and the other wants it. The *Latin* Edition of 1563 is without Numbers, as well as his undated *English* one, and why may not that also have been the Case of more *English* Editions than one? And then for his old Copy wanting the Title of the *Homily against Rebellion*, that is only an Argument, that it was printed before that *Homily* was made, which was not till the Year 1569, on occasion of the Rebellion in the *North* that Year; and this might very well be, and yet the Edition be five or six Years later than that of 1562 or 1563; but since this Edition, with all its appearance of Antiquity, is manifestly spurious, because it wants the contested Clause, which has been shewn to have pass'd the Convocation with all the rest of the Articles; why may we not suppose, that it was printed much later than it pretends; and that the numbers of the Articles, and the Title of the 21st *Homily* were left out by the same Fraud, that omitted the contested Clause, only to gain Credit to the Edition by these pretended Marks of An-

The agreement of these Editions in some particular does not prove them to be the same.

His Edition's wanting the Title of the Homily against Rebellion, does not prove it old enough.

All its marks of Antiquity may be owing to the same Fraud, that omitted the Clause.

¹ *Strype's Annals ad An. 1569. p. 552.*

Tho' it were as
ancient as he
pretends, it on-
ly proves, that
there was an
English Editi-
on of 1562
without, as
well as one
with the Clause
as there were
both in 1571,
when it might
be less expected.

tiquity, and by an Edition of so much Re-
putation for its Antiquity to weaken the
Authority of the Clause omitted in it. How-
ever tho' this Edition were as antient, as
it appears to be, and not only elder than
the *Homily against Rebellion*, but of equal
Antiquity with the first Impressions of the
Articles, yet since we have Dr. *Heylin's* ex-
press Testimony, that there was an *English*
as well as a *Latin* Edition of that date, in
which the controverted Clause was printed;
and this in a great measure confirm'd by
the Journals of Parliament, and by Bishop
Pearson; the most that can be made of this
other Old Edition is, that there was also
an *English* Edition of the same date without
the Clause, as we have seen there was in
the Year 1571, and both under the Names
of the same Printers, and this in 1562 was
not so strange as in 1571, since as I have
observ'd above, how justly soever the latter
might be censured, as a wilful omission of
a Clause, which had been admitted into
the Articles about nine Years before, tho' it
does not appear, that even then the Authori-
ty of the Clause was in the least call'd in
question; yet the former may be construe-
ed as only a backwardness to admit a
Clause, which had never yet been receiv'd
into the Articles, and might perhaps be
thought no more necessary, than in the Ar-
ticles of King *Edward*, which had pass'd
without this Clause ten Years before, and
remain'd without it all that time.

Before

Before I go off from *Ronald Wolfe's* Latin Edition of the Articles in 1563, which the English Copy printed the same Year is so far from bringing under the least Suspicion, that (as we have seen) it rather adds to its Authority; I cannot but observe, what a farther Addition of Authority that Impression has receiv'd from the Subscription made to it by the Lower House of the Convocation of 1571, as appears from the Original Instrument of that Subscription above-mention'd, tack'd to a Copy of this Edition, and still extant in the *Bodleian* Library; and as it is observable, that this Original Subscription was preserved by Mr. *Selden*, whom I suppose our Author does not suspect of any Share in the *Priest-Craft* he complains of, so that Gentleman, as little respect as he had for the Church's Power, yet asserted the Authority of the Clause that affirms it, as a thing most certain; for upon the Question, whether the Words (of having power in Controversies of Faith) were not stol'n into the 20th Article, 'tis most certain, (says he^k) they were in the Book of Articles, that was confirm'd, tho' in some Editions they have been left out. No doubt he meant this very Copy with the Label affix'd to it, by the Book of Articles that was confirmed; and as he had all the Assurance imaginable, that this was that very Book; so having this Book by him, he might very well affirm, that the Fact, to which this Book bears such undeniable

The Latin Edition of 1663 receiv'd a great Addition of Authority from the Subscription of the Lower House of the Convocation of 1571.

Mr. Selden who preserv'd this Subscrib'd Copy, did also assert the Authority of the Clause.

And was not improbably convinc'd of it by this Copy.

^k *Table Talk*. p. 34.

*He must have
known the
Hands of the
Subscribers.*

*Some of which
may be yet seen
on other Instru-
ments, and have
been compar'd,
and found to
agree.*

Testimony, was *most certain*. The assurance he had, that this was the very Book confirm'd by the Convocation of 1571, was not only its being first carefully revis'd, and all the Typographical Errors corrected by a hand of that Age, (which was most proper to prepare it for the Subscription of a Convocation) but its being actually subscrib'd by all the Lower House of the Convocation of 1571, which confirm'd the Articles pass'd in that of 1562; for he was so well skill'd in Antiquity, that he could not only discern between the Members of those two Convocations, which our Author's Oxford Friend could not; but in all likelihood was acquainted with many of the hands of these Subscribers, and therefore had the same undeniable proof of this Instrument's being an Original, that our Author produces from Bishop Burnet, in behalf of the Cambridge MS of 1562, viz. that *the Hands of the Subscribers are well known*, which those of this Label must needs have been to so great an Antiquary as Mr. Selden; since several of these Subscribers were Men of Note, and their Hands still appear on the publick Registers of the Colleges or Chapters in which they presid'd, and might be easily compar'd with those of this Scrole. For the Readers farther Satisfaction I have given my worthy Friend at Oxford the trouble to compare several of them; and he assures me they agree exactly, what with the Characters of some that I procur'd from

Cambridge, where they are better known, and the very hands of others, still extant in several Colleges in Oxford. But this *Scrole is pasted to the Cover of the Book*, says "our Oxford Detector of Frauds, and thence I suppose he would insinuate, that the *Artifice us'd at Oxford* was much of the same nature with that, which my Lord Clarendon tells " us, was us'd by the *Faction* to procure hands to their Seditious Petitions; viz: that the Label of Subscriptions affix'd to this Book, was taken from some other Instrument; which is also what our *Accuser* would insinuate " by his *forg'd Records*, with a *sham List of Names tack'd to them*: afterwards For this Book must be a Record, and the Subscription of one Convocation, be that of another, to furnish our Author with so remarkable an instance of *Priest-Craft in Perfection*. But what other Instrument was sign'd by the Convocation of 1571? For 'tis evident, this Label contains the Names of the Members of that Convocation, and those certainly written with their own hands, which can be no Sham List. The Canons indeed were sign'd in that Convocation, but only by the Upper House, as appears from the Title of them, and from an Original Subscription still extant; and yet if they had been also subscrib'd by the Lower House, that Subscription must have been made, as the other was, not upon a Label tack'd to a printed Copy, for there

Nor was this Label of Subscriptions taken from any other Instrument, and tack'd to this,

^m *Priest-Craft* p. 38.

ⁿ *Hist.* Vol. 1. p. 161.

^p *Priest-Craft*, p. 44.

could be no Copy of the Canons yet printed, but upon the MS it self; and therefore could by no *Artifice* be afterwards taken from thence, and affixed to this Book of Articles. But there is no end of Scruples of this Nature. The Articles of 1562 were to be revis'd by the Convocation of 1571, and confirm'd again by their Subscription. This is certified to have been done accordingly in the Ratification at the end of the Articles, and is agreed on all Hands. The only question is, concerning the original Instrument of this Subscription. Now in order to decide this dispute, we need only consider what kind of Instrument that must probably be, and then compare it with this we are speaking of. As they were the very Articles of 1562, that were to be thus reconfirmed without any Alteration, and they had been now printed for about nine Years, it must be thought most proper to make this Subscription to a printed Copy, and none fitter than this of *Ronald Wolfe*, being in the same Language with the Original Articles, and probably the first Impression of them. As they read them over in order hereunto, they would judge it convenient to correct all the *Errata* of the Press, because otherwise those *Errata* would be also confirm'd; and lastly they would make their Subscriptions upon a Scrole tack'd to the Book, because there was no other way of Subscribing it. Accordingly there appears a Copy of the Articles of that very Impression, with all the Errors of the Press corrected in it with a Pen,

It agrees in all respects with what it was reasonable to expect it should be.

Pen, by a Hand of that Age, and a Parchment Scrole affix'd to it, containing the Names of above 100 Members of the Lower House of that Convocation, written in their own Hands, many of them yet well known; and we are at a great loss after this to know, whether this be the Original Instrument of their Subscription; nay we make no difficulty to condemn it as a Counterfeit, upon I know not what surmises, that this Subscription might have belong'd to some other Instrument, only because it is not all of a piece with the Book, which it was impossible it should be: Tho' we were so much asham'd of this silly reason, that we have chose to alledge one, that if possible is yet sillier, viz. that the Subscribers are not the same with those of the Convocation of 1562. These Gentlemen's Heads do so run upon this being the Subscription of that Convocation, that they jumble Records with Books of Articles, Prints with MSS, and our Author arguing against the Original Articles appeal'd to by Arch-bishop *Laud*, among the wise questions above-mention'd, is angry with that Arch-bishop and his Chaplain, that they ^{or some body else had not told him,} in what manner this Book was subscrib'd, he means the Original Record, forgetting his own demonstration, that that Convocation ^{could not pass a printed Book, before it was printed,} and I hope he would not have had the Articles of 1562 printed, before they

The reason for surmising it to be a Counterfeit is so silly, that our Author chose to alledge one yet sillier.

^p Priest-Craft p. 39.

^a Ibid. p. 21,

Mr. Selden was as able to have detected this pretended Counterfeit, as these Gentlemen, and would have been as willing.

The assurance that here was no Counterfeit, did probably extort from him the Testimony, which he bears to the Authority of the Clause.

Yet he had other Arguments of its Authority.

were pass'd. But was not Mr. Selden as able to detect any Artifice us'd with relation to this Scrole, as either of our Discoverers? And had not he the Advantage of having the Book always by him, which one of these Gentlemen never saw, and the other by his blundering Account of it seems to have hardly look'd into? And as no Man would have been abler, and perhaps few more willing than Mr. Selden, to have discover'd a Fraud of this nature: So he of all men would not have preserv'd a Counterfeit, that was so likely to be one day made use of to a purpose, to which he was no great Friend. It was on the contrary, in all probability the certainty he had, that this Scrole was no Counterfeit, which extorted from him the attestation above-mention'd, that he gave to the Authority of the contested Clause of the Church's Power, tho' he did not want other Arguments to convince him of its Authority. Besides this Original Subscription of the Lower House of the Convocation of 1571 to the Articles and this Clause in them, he had also by him a Paper bearing Testimony to the Authority of the Clause, with Arch-bishop Laud's own hand to it, containing the 20th Article with the Clause in it, together with some extracts out of the Registers of the Convocations of 1562 and 1571, relating to the passing of the Articles; which Paper being still extant in the hands of a learned Person, is judged to be the very Copy under the Hand of a publick Notary

ry, produc'd by Arch-bishop Laud in the Star-Chamber. However a Person of Mr. Selden's Curiosity would hardly content himself even with this, when it was so easy to consult the Records themselves: Nay, we are assur'd by a Gentleman whose Credit our Author will not question, that he actually did consult them, viz. that during the long Parliament, and sitting of the Assembly at Westminster, Mr. Selden was employ'd to search the Arch-bishop's Office, for what Originals of the Articles there were there; and tho' this Gentleman tells us, that he had heard, and did believe, that if he had not some honest Puritans can, says he, and will make it good, that upon this search Mr. Selden could find no other Articles there, but that printed Copy, which Burton, it seems, complain'd of, subscrib'd with the Hands of the Bishops, and Lower House of Convocation, at divers times. Yet notwithstanding what he either believ'd or heard, 'tis certain they never did make this good, and therefore that they never could do it. I have observed above, from one long Answer to the Arch-bishop's Speech, that this was not attempted, when the matter was fresh, and could not fail to be enquired into: since then I have met with another Answer to the same Speech, or rather some short Notes upon it, which considering the Author of them, a Man of no less Character and Ability than Arch-bishop Williams, and his

He had by him the Copy from the publick Records produc'd in the Star-Chamber by Arch-bishop Laud, and had been employed to examine the Records themselves.

which the Arch-bishop appeal'd to, we should have heard of it.

Yet Arch-bishop Williams objects nothing against this part of Arch-bishop Laud's Speech in his severe MS Annotations on it.

† Hamilton's *some Necess. of Reform.* p. 14. † Sup.

Enmity to Arch-bishop *Laud*, too visible in these Notes, if it were not otherwise so well known, are a great Confirmation of this truth. For tho' in these Annotations he is so very severe upon Arch-bishop *Laud*, that I am willing to hope, he never design'd they should come abroad (indeed they are only short Strictures on his Speech, written in the margin of a printed Copy of it) yet he offers not one Word against the Arch-bishop's Defence, with relation to the Forgery of the contested Clause; but only confirms what the Arch-bishop owns as to the heinous nature of such a Forgery; reflects with great bitterness upon that *deep Censure*, which Arch-bishop *Laud* says, *he would have besought the Lords, might have been laid upon it*, he means upon this Slander of Forgery, if it had been annexed to the information against *Burton*; and when the Arch-bishop in the Conclusion of this part of his Speech retorts the *foul Charge* upon the *pure Sect*, he endeavours to ridicule it in these Words, *well and valiantly charg'd, but upon weak Foundations*. If Arch-bishop *Laud* had falsify'd the Publick Records, it is hardly credible, either that Arch-bishop *Williams* should not have known it, or that he should have conceal'd it, or at least have said nothing of it in private Notes, written with so much sharpness. A Copy of these Notes taken from Arch-bishop *Williams*'s own Hand, was most obligingly communicated to me by *Thomas Rawlinson Esq;* of the *Middle-Temple*, a Gentleman whose extraordinary Knowledge in Books, both MS and Print, appears

Where is a Copy
of the MS, Annotations.

appears from that valuable Collection he has made of both, and only yields to the great goodness, with which he communicates them. But to return to Mr. Selden's search of the Arch-bishop's Office. This search was probably made at the same time, and for the same purpose, that a Committee of the House of Commons sent to the Arch-bishop in the Tower, to require him to send them word under his hand, what Originals he had of the Articles, and the Arch-bishop suspected ^{the design of that Message} was to *make a Search about the* contested Clause of the 20th Article, which he thereupon takes occasion to vindicate again here, saying most expressly, that (tho' left out in divers printed Copies, &c. yet) *in the Original Articles of 1562 the words are plain and manifest, without any interlining at all.* It was now about six Years since he had made the same defence in behalf of the Clause in his Star-Chamber Speech, by appealing to the Records in his Office, and producing an Authentick Copy from thence of the 20th Article with that Clause in it; and tho' Mr. Hamilton is pleas'd to insinuate ^{what he dare not assert, that the Bishop and his Officer egregiously impos'd upon the Star-Chamber, and that neither his Officer, nor he had any thing to shew, but that printed Copy above-mention'd: Nay, tho' our Author, adding his own assurance to the Objections he borrows from this Gentleman and others, goes farther and undertakes to prove, that the Arch bishop only *put a falsehood upon the*}

Tho' this search was made to find Matter of Accusation against the Arch-bishop, yet nothing of this nature was objected at his Trial,

* Hist. of his Troub. p. 208. * Ibid. p. 209. * Some Necefs. ubi. sup. World

Tho' his falsifying the Records, if prov'd, had been a blacker Article of his Impeachment than any.

And according to his Accusers, a greater proof of his attempting to bring in Popery.

World, and that there could be no such Records as he appeal'd to in the Office at that time; yet in all this time, and after all this Search, his Enemies were utterly unable to prove any such falshood upon him; insomuch, that tho' they had releas'd *Burton*, as well as *Bastwick* and *Pryn*, declared the Proceedings against them in the Star-Chamber illegal, and that they ought to have Satisfaction made them; and during the Arch-bishop's long Confinement, encourag'd them, and all his Enemies to bring in Accusations against him, yet there is not the least tittle of falsifying the Records charg'd in any Article of his Impeachment; which in a point of this Importance would it self have made a blacker Article than any; and tho' the Sum of what they charg'd him with, was a design of altering the Constitution in Church and State, and bringing in Popery and Arbitrary Power; and tho' in two Articles successively he is accus'd of aiming at a *vast, unlawful, and presumptuous Power*, nay one *that is Papal and Tyrannical, in himself and Successors*, and in a third, of *maintaining Popish Doctrines contrary to the Articles of Religion*, yet there is not a word of his adding this *Popish Clause* to one of the Articles, or of falsifying the Records to support an Authority in Bishops, which our *Reformer of the Reformation* tells us ¹, *will bring back all the absurdities of Popery, and is it self the chief of them*; not the least mention

¹ *Hist. of his Troub. p. 154, &c.*

² *Priest-Craft p. 5.*

of this new Article of Religion, brought from Rome, which gave the Prelates full Power to alter the Doctrine and Discipline of our Church at a blow; tho' nothing could be a greater Proof of his aiming to bring in Popery. Nothing done in their pretended Synod to wipe off the Scandal of this Popish Clause, as this Gentleman expresses ^a that noble Service to our most excellent and pure Church, and that great honour to the memory of our glorious Reformers, which he piously designs in this Libel, and recommends upon no less Authority, than that of his own persuasion, to the Care of the Legislature, ^{No notice was taken of this Matter by the pretended Synod then sitting tho' the Archbishop himself expected there would.} at the same time, says he, that they are clearing her (he means the Church) from maintaining the most absurd and blasphemous Doctrine of passive Obedience; a Doctrine as absurd and blasphemous, as this Clause is scandalous and popish; and yet as the Legislature have not thought fit to follow the Directions of this judicious Reformer, and accomplished Politician: So neither did that pretended Synod, as much as one would expect they should have been of our Author's Sentiments, judge it proper at that time, to take any notice of this suppos'd Corruption of the 20th Article, tho' they had probably as little liking to the contested Clause, as this Gentleman has; and tho' the Arch-bishop justly suspected ^b, that it was with such a Design, that he was sent to about the Articles. Nothing could be found in all their Searches, either of falshood in him, or

^a Priestcraft p. 9. ^b Hist. of Troub. p. 209.

Instead of any thing of this nature, Mr. Selden, that was to have been the Arch-bishop's Accuser became his Advocate; the Assembly of Divines establish the Authority asserted in the contested Clause.

The reasons offer'd in 1660 for necessity of Reformation object nothing against it.

of forgery in the Clause; but instead of any thing of that nature, all their inquiries on this occasion only tended to clear the innocence of the one, and the truth of the other; and Mr. Selden, the person employed in this Search, in order to have been the Arch-bishop's Accuser, yields to the irresistible force of truth, and generously becomes his Advocate. And that famous Assembly of Divines were so far from enacting any thing in prejudice of the Clause, that as a late Author observes^c, they established the Authority asserted by it in their *Confession of Faith*. And after the party had been absolute Masters of all the Records in the Kingdom, and indeed of the Kingdom it self for about 12 Years, and may be said to have govern'd for near 20, when in the Year 1660 their *Reasons for the necessity of Reformation* in the Church were offer'd to the Parliament by divers Ministers of sundry Counties in England, tho' one of their objections was against the 20th Article, and against this very Clause of it, yet they are so far there from questioning its Authority, that they evidently suppose it, and only complain^d, that *it being said Article 20th, The Church has Power to decree Rites and Ceremonies, and Authority in Controversies of Faith, we may not, say they, enquire what is meant by the Church, whether the Church Catholick, or of England: Nor what the Church of England is: What Rites and*

^c Laycraft Exempt. p. 5. ^d Reasons shewing the Necess. of Reform, &c. p. 3.

^d Reasons shewing the

Ceremonies it may ordain; or how far her Authority extends in Controversies of Faith, &c. and Bishop Pearson in his Excellent Answer to this Treatise, having told them^e from the Postscript in Wolfe's Edition of the Articles, and from Arch-bishop Laud's Speech, where the Original Articles were enroll'd; and that this was known to those that knew the publick Records, (unknown, says he, perhaps to the Ministers of sundry Count-^{ies}) Dr. Burges in his Reply^e to the Bi-^{Nor Burges's} shop, does not deny this, which is mani-^{Defence of} festly owning it; and the Bishop in his An-^{them.} swer^e to the Dr. tells him, that he had shew'd, *that the Record, that is the Original of the Articles, was to be found, and adds, the Articles are as much enroll'd now, as they were when any Persons were punished for not reading them, &c.* I may add, that neither the Truth of this Record, nor the ^{Nor the Confe-} Authority of the Clause, for which it was ^{rence at the Sa-} appeal'd to, was question'd in the famous ^{voy, tho' it con-} Conference^a at the Savoy, tho' all that ^{cluded in a dis-} Conference finally concluded in a Dispute ^{pute concerning} the Authority ^{the Authority} concerning the Power asserted in this Clause: ^{asserted in this} nor has been excepted against, that I know ^{Clause.} of, to this day, till our Author thought fit to revive the dispute; and he that can think after all this, that there were no such Records as Arch-bishop Laud appeal'd

^a No Necess. of Reform. ubi sup. p. 362, 363. ^e Word by way of Postscript. ^a Biblioth. Script. Eccl. Angl. p. 385, 386. ^b Vide Account of Proceed. of the Commissioners for reviewing of Common-Prayer, &c. Lond. 1661. Bishop of Worcester's Vindication of himself against Baxter. Lond. 1662.

to, tho' by that appeal he so effectually silenced the whole party, is not capable of being convinc'd by any Argument whatever.

This Oxford Copy with the Scrole affix'd to it is probably that which Burton pretended was all Mr. Selden could find in the Arch-bishop's Office.

What that printed Copy was, which Burton complain'd of, and is pretended to have been all, that Mr. Selden could find in the Office, it is not easie to know; but most probably it was this very Edition of *Renald Wolfe*, with the Label of Subscriptions tack'd to it, and that their representing it as subscrib'd by the Bishops, as well as by the Lower House, was only speaking, as our Modern *Libeller* often does of Books and MSS, that he knows nothing of, and asserting this upon as good Authority, as what is added afterwards, that it was subscrib'd at divers times, a thing hardly possible to be known so long after the Subscription. And yet if this had been all the Copies or Originals of the Articles, found by Mr. Selden in the Arch-bishop's Office, (tho' the Arch-bishop would certainly have heard of that in both his Ears,) yet it greatly adds to the Authority of *Wolfe's* Edition of the Articles, and of the Subscription annex'd to this Copy of it, that this alone was able to convince Mr. Selden; a Man of his great Sagacity, and in a point he was no friend to, and that to such a degree, that tho' he had discover'd an Arch-bishop falsifying the publick Records in defence of this point, (upon an impossible Supposition, that he could have made that discovery, and taken no notice of it) yet even so foul a practice was an Argument of less weight against the truth of what it

was

Even that, if true, had much added to the Authority of this Copy.

was made use of to support, than this one Copy and Subscription was for it.

As to the *two Instances* produc'dⁱ by our Author to shew, how *very practicable* it was *for some Men to impose upon others* (he means to forge and insert the contested Clause into this early Edition of the Articles) *while things were fresh and well known*; It appears sufficiently from his own Account of them, that there was no Imposition in either of those Instances; but that both the Articles of 1552, and the Catechism of the same date, as they are generally ascrib'd to the Convocation of that Year, so were really pass'd, and agreed upon by the Authority of that Convocation; namely by certain Ecclesiastical Commissioners appointed by the King, and invested with Authority by that Convocation, to draw up and agree upon the said Articles and Catechism: this is the very Account which our *Libeller* himself gives of this matter from the Mouths of two Martyrs, *Cranmer* and *Philpot*, who being accused in *Queen Mary's* time of having impos'd these Articles and this Catechism upon the Convocation, answer'd, that they had been both agreed on by Persons, to whom the Synodical Authority had been committed for that purpose: He might have found this Answer where^{*} he seems to have borrow'd the Argument.

Having thus at large vindicated the first *English* and *Latin* Editions of the Articles from the Exceptions of our Author, and shewn that both of them contain'd the Af-

The instances produc'd to shew, how easie it was to foist the Clause into this early Edition, appear from the Libeller's own Account of them, to have been no impositions.

ⁱ *Priest-Craft* p. 28.

^{*} *Heyl, Eccles. Restaur. ad an*

1552. p. 221, 122.

All the Editions of the Articles since the whole of 1563, except two or three that are spurious, do likewise contain the contested Clause.

Three different English Editions of 1471, with the Clause still extant, and a Latin one of that Year by John Day had it.

firmative Clause of the Church's Power, and were both genuine; tho' he is pleas'd to take notice of no other Edition, but what wanted the Clause, till those mention'd by Arch-bishop *Laud*, and Dr. *Heylin*, yet I shall shew him from several Copies still extant, that from the very first passing of these Articles down to this day, they have been printed from time to time, conformably to all our modern Editions; and tho' there have been two or three spurious Impressions of them, in which the contested Clause has been omitted, yet generally all along that Clause has been printed with the rest of the Articles. The next Edition we meet with after those of 1563, which neither of them wanted the Clause, except the *English* one without date and numbers, (which whether it were printed that, or what other Year is not known) the next to these are the *English* and *Latin* Editions of 1571, of which tho' there was a spurious one of each sort without the Clause, yet we have still extant Copies with the Clause of three different Editions of that Year in *English*, and have the Testimony both of Bishop *Sparrow*, and Bishop *Barlow*, that there was also a *Latin* Impression of the same Year with the Clause, printed by that very *John Day*, whose Name is prefix'd to a Copy of 1571, without the Clause. And these Editions appearing to have been all wrought off after the Convocation of that Year, by the Confirmation printed at the end of the Articles, which refers to that Convocation, they are so many Evidences,

dences, that the contested Clause contain'd in them, was also confirmed with the Articles by that Convocation: Since as was argued above from the *Latin* Impression of 1562, it would have been too bold an attempt so soon after the Convocation, to have inserted a Clause into several Editions of the Articles, which not only had not been confirmed by that Convocation, but had been excluded by it; as it ~~must~~ have been, if they did not confirm it; since it has been shewn to have pass'd the Convocation of 1562: and as this would have been too bold an attempt; so it was impossible it should not be taken notice of, while the matter was thus fresh. But the leaving out of the Clause in some of the Editions of that Year, was not so liable to be observ'd; both because an omission is not so obvious as an insertion, and because in all probability such spurious Copies were not so publick, at least when first printed. Nor was the omission of the Clause likely to incur so much *odium*, as the forsting of it in: since the latter was capable of no interpretation, but that of a down right Forgery, whereas the former would have admitted of this plausible excuse, that it was only printing the Article, as it had stood for ten Years; and this is the fairest Account that can be given of *John Day's* Edition of 1571 without the Clause, not unlike what was given above * of Dr. *Mock-*
er's, and in my Opinion no way improba-

* *Sup. p. 55.*

A probable account how it came to be omitted in an Edition of that Year by the same John Day.

ble: for *John Day* having printed¹ an *English* Edition of *Edward VI's* Articles A°. 1553, and been^m a Confessor and Exile in Queen *Mary's* time as well as his great Friend *John Fox* the Martyrologist, whose Printer *John Day*ⁿ was, and having in this very Year 1571, just before the meeting of the Convocation, printed the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum* published by *John Fox*, in which the 20th Article stands^o without the Clause of the Church's Power, as in the Articles of *Edward VI*, the Book having perhaps for that reason^p been brought into the Parliament that Year by Mr. *Norton*, and the factious Party: From all this and the difference observable in some other particulars between *John Day's* and the former *Latin* Edition of the Articles, which must have been done under some direction, and by none more likely than by his Friend Mr. *Fox*, who was one of those that refused to subscribe the Articles, and had, as was now said, just publish'd the 20th without the Clause: From all this, I say, it is very probable, that *Day* was easily persuaded by *Fox* to print the Article in this Edition, as he had done twice before; and the Government, for some Years at least, being very tender of such Persons as had been Confessors under Queen *Mary* (which we have seen both

¹ No Necess. of Reform. ubi sup. p. 356. ^m Strype's Annals p. 177. ⁿ Ibid c. 21. p. 243. ^o Reform. Leg. Eccl. p. 5. Ed. 1640. ^p Sir Sim. D'Ewes Journ. p. 157.

Fox and Day were) infomuch as to connive at several of them, who were very free and bold in impugning the Rites and Discipline of the Church, and to suffer *John Fox* to hold a good Prebend, (as it is thought) without subscribing; the omission of the Clause might be also, on account of their Sufferings, indulg'd to these two privileg'd Persons, who in their moderation might propose hereby to make the Terms of Communion more easie, or have some other like Reasons for suiting this to those former Editions; and yet this Edition of the Articles however conniv'd at, was not authoriz'd; for it has not the Royal Licence, his *editi auctoritate Serenissima Regina* referring to the Articles of 1562, from which this Copy considerably varies; and yet the Translation of the Canons of the Convocation of 1571 was publish'd by him the same Year, *cum gratia & privilegio Regiæ Majestatis*, tho' that also varies from the Original, the Title *Liber quorundam Canonum Disciplina Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*, being translated, *A Book of certain Canons concerning some part of the Discipline of the Church of England*, referring probably to the other Part in the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*, and what is more remarkable, by way of Complement to *John Fox*, *Plenam illam Historiam quæ inscribitur Monumenta Martyrum*^a, is here render'd^r, *That full and perfect History, which is intituled Monumentes of Martyres*; from which we may observe, that he who would abuse his Licence

^a Sparrow's Collect p. 227. ^r Can. Edit. 1571. p. 6:

in such a manner, was likely to take greater Liberty, where he had not that restraint; and that tho' all this was conniv'd at in a privileg'd Person, yet there must be some reason, why even he could not procure the same Licence for his Edition of the Articles, as for that of the Canons, and none so likely, as that his Alterations in the former were of so much more importance, than in the latter. If this Account of *Day's* printing an Edition of the Articles without the Clause be admitted, which some might think the more excusable, because, as we have seen, he publish'd another Edition the same Year with the Clause, we may account the same way for another *Latin* one of *Day's* in the Year 1575, which also wants the Clause. There was probably more of the *malice of the opposite Faction*, in omitting the Clause in the *English* Edition of 1571, since that has both the Names of the Queen's Printers, and the Countenance of the Royal Authority, and indeed agrees most exactly in every thing with one of the genuine Editions of that Year, except only in the want of this Clause; *John Day's* of 1575 is the next Edition of the Articles, that I have any account of, and the last printed without the Clause, except those in the Harmonies of Confession, with one of which Dr. *Prideaux* would have impos'd * upon Dr. *Heylin*; that by Dr. *Mocket* above-mention'd, and that attempted at *Oxford* in the Year 1636 and immediately suppress'd, of which I have given

And in one of
the Year 1575.

* *Sup. p. 63.*

* *Heyl. Append. to Exam. Hist.*

some Account * above. In 1579 the Articles were printed again in *English*, and after that in 1581, 1586, 1593, and so on down to our time, always by Royal Authority, and always with the Affirmative Clause of the Church's Power in them, and in all the Editions since the Year 1628, with the King's Declaration also before them, which gives them a new ratification. In 1579 Rogers put out his first Edition of the Articles, with his Exposition of them, under the Title of the *English Creed*, printed for *Andrew Maunsell*, if we believe *Maunsell's* own Catalogue, printed in 1595, the very Date which *Dr. Fuller* gives to *Roger's* Book (when he quotes it for the Authority of the controverted Clause) either confounding the date with that of this Catalogue, where he probably met with this first Edition of it, or perhaps mistaking it for the Year 1585; for *Roger's* next Edition (tho' I have some reason to think it was his first) was printed the former part of it in 1585, the latter, which begins with the 20th Article, in 1587. When both parts were first printed together, I do not know; but in 1607 they came out with a Preface or Dedication to Arch-bishop *Bancroft*; and that these Editions had the Clause in them appears from several Copies of them still extant; (I except that of 1579, which I could never find, not even in *Christ-Church*, of which the Author was Student) it appears likewise from all the

All the English Editions from 1579 have the Clause.

Particularly Roger's English Creed, first printed that Year, if we believe Andrew Maunsell's Catalogue.

* *Sup. p. 130.* * *Church Hist. Cent. 16. p. 74.*

A Vindication of the

Impressions of that Book since ; in which that Clause is expounded in three propositions rais'd from it ; but most particularly from a passage in his Preface to the Arch-bishop, where he says most expressly, that the Articles to which Subscription was requir'd by the 36th Canon of King James, are the same with those pass'd in the Convocation of 1562, *even the same Articles*, says he*, *for number 39, no more, no fewer, and for Words, Syllables, and Letters, the very same, unaugmented, undiminisbed, unaltered*. Now whether he first writ upon the Articles in 1579 or no, since he *publish'd his Subscription to them* (as he says ') 22 Years before that Preface to the Arch-bishop, viz. in 1585, by which I think it is evident he means, his *English Creed* publish'd that Year, which in his Dedication he calls *his Subscription to the English Creed*; for 'tis likely he

His Testimony that these were the same Articles with those of 1562, at least extends to all the Editions back to 1585, and confirms the Authority of the Clause it self.

subscrib'd the Articles long before : This is a Testimony in behalf of the controverted Clause from a printed Copy at least eight Years elder, than any English Edition our Author is willing to allow to have had the Clause in it; and unless we can think this learned Man would speak without Book, concerning all the Editions of the Articles antecedent to that which he subscrib'd, we know not how long before 1585, which it self might be also of much elder date than the Year in which he subscrib'd it; this Passage must be allow'd to be a good Testimony also concerning them; at least, which

* Rog. Expos. Dedic. §. 28.

¶ Ibid. §. 37.

is more to my purpose, it is an evidence concerning the Clause it self, that whatever Editions of the Articles might have left it out, it was most certainly Authentick, and had pass'd the Convocation of 1562, together, with all the rest of the Articles.

But to return to the English Editions of 1581, and 1586, of which there are several Copies still extant; and I have two by me I was the more willing to mention those two Editions, not only because they are both elder, than that of 1593, which the Author of *Priest-Craft* would have us think, to be the first *English* Edition that has the contested Clause; but chiefly because these very Editions are in the publick Library at *Oxford*; and if we are not mistaken in our *Libeller's* correspondent, were put into his Hands, when he was enquiring after the old Copies of Articles in that Library, for the information of this worthy Friend of his at *London*; or whoever his *Oxford* Intelligencer were, either he or our Author have discover'd great disingenuity in this Affair; he in not transmitting the Account of these Editions with the Clause, and what other notices the *Bodleian* Library affords in behalf of it's Authority, or our Author in receiving those notices, and yet suppressing them, and only publishing so much of his Account from *Oxford*, as he thought conduc'd to his purpose. If he knew there was an Edition of the Articles with the Clause in 1581, how could he pretend, that the Clause was left out of the printed Copies for 22 Years after

The Editions of 1581, and 1586 are still extant, as our Author, or at least his Oxford Friend must know.

Yet our Author would persuade us, that the Clause was omitted till the Year 1593.

A Vindication of the

Impressions of that Book since; in which that Clause is expounded in three propositions rais'd from it; but most particularly from a passage in his Preface to the Arch-bishop, where he says most expressly, that the Articles to which Subscription was requir'd by the 36th Canon of King James, are the same with those pass'd in the Convocation of 1562, *even the same Articles*, says he*, *for number 39, no more, no fewer, and for Words, Syllables, and Letters, the very same, unaugmented, undiminisb'd, unaltered*. Now whether he first writ upon the Articles in 1579 or no, since he *published his Subscription to them* (as he says) 22 Years before that Preface to the Arch-bishop, viz. in 1585, by which I think it is evident he means, his *English Creed* publish'd that Year, which in his Dedication he calls *his Subscription to the English Creed*; for 'tis likely he

His Testimony that these were the same Articles with those of 1562, at least extends to all the Editions back to 1585, and confirms the Authority of the Clause is self.

subscrib'd the Articles long before: This is a Testimony in behalf of the controverted Clause from a printed Copy at least eight Years elder, than any English Edition our Author is willing to allow to have had the Clause in it; and unless we can think this learned Man would speak without Book, concerning all the Editions of the Articles antecedent to that which he subscrib'd, we know not how long before 1585, which it self might be also of much elder date than the Year in which he subscrib'd it; this Passage must be allow'd to be a good Testimony also concerning them; at least, which

* Rog. *Expos. Dedic.* §. 28.

¶ Ibid. §. 37.

is more to my purpose, it is an evidence concerning the Clause it self, that whatever Editions of the Articles might have left it out, it was most certainly Authentick, and had pass'd the Convocation of 1562, together, with all the rest of the Articles.

But to return to the English Editions of 1581, and 1586, of which there are several Copies still extant; and I have two by me I was the more willing to mention those two Editions, not only because they are both elder, than that of 1593, which the Author of *Priest-Craft* would have us think, to be the first *English* Edition that has the contested Clause; but chiefly because these very Editions are in the publick Library at *Oxford*; and if we are not mistaken in our *Libeller's* correspondent, were put into his Hands, when he was enquiring after the old Copies of Articles in that Library, for the information of this worthy Friend of his at *London*; or whoever his *Oxford* Intelligencer were, either he or our Author have discover'd great disingenuity in this Affair; he in not transmitting the Account of these Editions with the Clause, and what other notices the *Bodleian* Library affords in behalf of it's Authority, or our Author in receiving those notices, and yet suppressing them, and only publishing so much of his Account from *Oxford*, as he thought conduc'd to his purpose. If he knew there was an Edition of the Articles with the Clause in 1581, how could he pretend, that the Clause was left out of the printed Copies for 22 Years after

The Editions of 1581, and 1586 are still extant, as our Author, or at least his Oxford Friend must know.

Yet our Author would persuade us, that the Clause was omitted till the Year 1593.

*Which discovers
his or his Cor-
respondent's
disingenuity.*

*An Edition of
1642 with the
Clause, which
seems to have
been publish'd
by the Faction,
after they were
convinc'd of its
Authority.*

ter that Edition, which omitted it in 1571? And to what purpose was it to pretend Arch-bishop *Land's* and Dr. *Heylin's* Confession of a Fact, which himself knew to be false, if at least he knew, that it was not 22 Years between 1571, and 1581? But if he knew nothing of that Edition, nor of the other in 1586, both which contain the contested Clause, and both are in the publick Library of *Oxford*, what account will his Correspondent give to him and the World, of having taken no notice to him of these Editions of the Articles, which he must have seen in the *Bodleian* Library, and which, if we be not mistaken in our Man, were actually shewn him there, when he was sent to for an account of the Ancient Copies of the Articles in that Library? But I shall leave him and his *Oxford* Friend to agree to which of them the honour of so ingenuous a proceeding is most due, and shall only mention one other *English* Edition of the Articles, since the time that our Author owns the Clause to have been put into the printed Copies, and that is an Edition of the Year 1642, when one would have expected it should have been put out again, especially if this Edition were published by the Faction, that ran so high at that time, as it seems to have been, by its coming forth under no Printers Names, whereas all the other *English* Editions bear the Names of the King's or Queen's Printers, and by its being expressly said to be printed for the Benefit of the Common-wealth; and yet this Copy agrees to a Tittle, as far as

I have observ'd, with all the other genuine Impressions of the Articles, even with that of 1628; inſomuch that it hath both *the Royal Declaration prefix'd to it*, and is ſaid to be reprinted *therewith by his Majesty's Commandment*; tho' we know that of 1628 was the very Impreſſion, into which the conteſted Clause, in affront of that Declaration, was pretended to have been firſt *joisted* by the *Prelates*: And that Clause being alſo printed in this Edition of 1642, ſeems to be not only a Teſtimony of our Enemies in its behalf, but a plain evidence, that the Faction itſelf had been *ſo far miſſed* in this matter, as this Gentleman expreſſes it^o, by *Arch-biſhop Laud's Speech in the Star-Chamber*, eſpecially when upon the ſtricteſt ſearch in his Office they had not been able to find the leaſt Flaw in it, that they alſo began to *imagine*, *that the Clause was extant in the Records of the Convocation of 1562*, and therefore was of equal Authority with all the reſt of the Articles.

And now I ſhall take a ſhort view of ^{*A ſhort View of the Inferences with which he concludes.*} the Inferences, with which our Author concludes his *Priest-Craft in Perfection*, and gives the finiſhing ſtroke to this Libel againſt our Church and Religion.

1^{ſt}, From his firſt inference^p we may obſerve, that they are an admirable *majority of Chriſtians*, with whom *tradition* or any other Means whatſoever has *gone a great*

^o *Pr. Cr. p. 15.*

^p *Ibid. p. 46.*

way towards making the Word of God of none effect.

2dly, You are to note, that they are always the *gravest Divines*, who *think themselves* most especially *oblig'd in Conscience* to *promote the good of the Church by Fraud*; so that you are to be upon your Guard, where the Clergy are grave and serious: But if any of them happen to be merry and ludicrous, there is less danger of their *tricks*. Arch-bishop *Laud's* and Bishop *Pearson's* Testimony is to be condemn'd upon a phrase of Arch-bishop *Tillotson*, and both of them accus'd of *offering things to the World against their own Knowledge*, only because there are some Men, *who use that trick of the Zealots* (as Arch-bishop *Tillotson* merrily phrases it) *of lying for the truth*.

3dly, This Gentleman's Compassion is very extensive, he pities the whole World, who might very easily be impos'd upon *before printing was invented*, which is kindly to infer, that all *Christendom* lay in ignorance and darkness from Christ and his Apostles to the Times of *Guttenburg, Coster, and Faustus*; and if we have any good Expositions upon the Scriptures, we owe them rather to the diligence and accuracy of the Printers, than to the labours of the Fathers, who, as he wisely observes,

4thly, *Have laid out their Natural Talents in Alterations, Interpolations, and Rasures*, as to all the Books of Bulk, that have gone thro' their Hands: So that we can lay

no stress on their Authority: And then we may agree with him,

5thly, That advantageous discoveries are made from hence as to true Religion, which doubtless all well meaning men would sooner come at, if it was neither to be explain'd by the Priest, nor protected by the Civil Magistrate; for these two sorts of People are, it seems, with him the greatest obstacle to the knowledge of *Man's duty to God*. So that as before he fairly clear'd Religion from the rubbish and obscurity, which Councils, Fathers, Commentators, and the gravest Divines might have put upon it, in a word from the uncertainty of Tradition, to which yet he presently appeals^p for the support of the Scriptures themselves: So he has here taken from it the assistance of the Priest and the Magistrate, wiped off the Scandal of all such Popish Authority, and kindly left it to shift for it self. And,

6thly, his flourish at last in Complement of the Scriptures, after he has been endeavouring to overthrow the best Evidence we have of their truth, is nothing but a Copy of his Countenance; for if there be any weight in what he says against the Councils, Fathers, &c. he need only bring his Artillery closer, and raise his Batteries higher against some other Books of bulk, and in a second Part of *Priest-craft in Perfection* (for he has yet only produc'd^q what he thinks fit at present) we may find some Frauds detected, not only in the Articles

^p Pr. Cr. p. 47.

^q Ibid. p. 45.

of the Church of *England*, but in some of the Apostles Writings to the Churches of *Corinth*, *Ephesus*, &c. and in the very Gospels themselves: For unhappily these also make a *Book of bulk*, that has gone thro' the Hands of the Ecclesiasticks, and then what stress or dependance can we lay on their Authority?

Other Inferences, which conclude this Vindication.

And now having done with his Inferences, and having the honour of his Example, I shall conclude with one or two of mine own, but those drawn not like his only for the sake of his Friends, who by the nature of his Inferences appear to be as much Enemies both to the Church, and to all Religion, as himself; but for the sake of Friends and Enemies too, as well such as he and the rest of the Pestilent Writers of this Licentious Age have corrupted with their Atheistical Principles, the Disciples of these *Fools* of the Prophet David's time, who, as one well observes, are the *Witts of ours*, as those whom (we trust) neither some modern Commentators upon the Bible, and Compilers of *Bibliotheques* and *Critical Dictionaries* abroad, nor the *Defenders of the Rights of the Christian Church* and *Detectors of Priest-craft* at home, will be ever able to corrupt.

If therefore, as I hope has been sufficiently made appear, both the matter of the contested Clause is true, and the Authority of it unquestionable: If there be no Power asserted in it, but what is essential to eve-

* *Pr. Cr.* p. 45. * *Psal.* 53. 1.

ry National Church, and what our own evidently claims in these very Articles, exclusive of this Clause: And if the charge of Forgery, on occasion of this farther assertion of that just Power, first objected, as far as we can find by *Burton*, was then so undeniably confuted, and retorted upon the Accusers by Arch-bishop *Laud*, that none of them have been ever able since, either to invalidate the Arch-bishop's Proofs, or to defend themselves; and the controversy had in all probability lay dead for ever, if the Author of *Priest-craft* had not thought fit to revive it, probably with the same pious design, that his Predecessors in the Faction first rais'd it: If all that Additional Evidence, on which he is pleas'd to renew this heavy charge, be such as was rejected by those Ancient *Libellers*, because it was evidently of no Moment; and has only an appearance of some weight now, because the Records of Convocation then extant, and produc'd to confront this bold charge, are since unhappily destroy'd, and our Adversaries, who had too much hand in destroying them, are willing to hope they are also forgot: If in a word there neither is now, nor ever was, either the least reason to induce the Clergy to commit this pretended Forgery, or any just grounds to accuse them of having committed it; but all the Fraud with relation to the Clause of the Church's Power has been apparently committed by our *Accusers*, in raising and expunging it; and notwithstanding that by the *malicious cunning of the*

3

Faction

Faſſion it has been omitted in ſome few Editions, yet it was certainly paſſ'd in the Convocation of 1562, together with all the reſt of the Articles, was confirmed with them in that of 1571, and ſubſcription enjoyn'd to it by the Act of Parliament that Year; and was accordingly contain'd both in the Original Records of the Articles, and in the firſt Editions printed from thence, and has been generally in all the Editions ſince down to this day. If all this be ſo, as I hope has been ſufficiently prov'd above; and this Gentleman be ſo far from having *demonſtrated*, as he pretends^c, *both the Forgery and Abſurdity of the Clause*, that in direct contradiction to what he ſo boldly asserts^d, there is nothing appears for rejecting it, but *Artifice and prevarication*, and there is the *greateſt Evidence in the World* for retaining it. Then,

1^{ſt}, I hope this at leaſt may prevent the danger of what he is pleas'd to infer from this pretended Forgery againſt the *certain-ty of Tradition*, and the *Evidence of the graveſt Divines in Church matters*; againſt the Credit of all that was delivered to us before Printing was invented; againſt the *Authority of Fathers and Councils*, and of all *Books of bulk*, that have come to us thro' the *Hands of Eccleſiaſticks*; againſt the Advantage which *true Religion* receives from the *Aſſiſtance of Priests*, and the protection of *Magiſtrates*, which in his Account are the two chief obſtructions to it; and laſtly

^c *Prieſt-Craft* p. 45.

^d *Ibid.* p. 39.

against the Authority of the Scriptures themselves, which it is manifestly the aim of all his Inferences to undermine, at the same time that he would be thought to intend nothing more, than to support them. And if the Author of *Priest-Craft* should by these Inferences, and some other sly insinuations in this Pamphlet, against the Christian Religion, as well as Priesthood, happen to *expose himself to the Imputation of Atheism*, I hope he will no longer lay that upon his *medling with such sacred things, as the Articles of our Church*, but upon his Atheistical manner of medling, not only with her Articles, but with her very Bible: And whatever he may be *so irrational to propose* to himself, if a Priest of that Church, which he has so much abus'd, has thought himself oblig'd to undertake her defence; this Gentleman, who is an Enemy to the whole Function, must not think it sufficient, to have endeavour'd before-hand to fix an *odium* both on the Author and his Performance, by stiling the former a *Highb-Church Priest*, only for defending the Cause of every Priest in the Church; and by calling that defence of the Church and Priesthood, with his usual good manners, *a greater noise and zeal than ever in its behalf*. He must remember that we are not scolding but disputing, where the Business is arguing, not calling names; and if this be his way of arguing, he does ill to cast that Reflection upon our Argu-

^v *Priest-Craft* p. 23, 24.

ments, which are all the noise that he has reason to apprehend upon this occasion, when his own are so much noise and nothing else, and his zeal so far superiour to his Knowledge.

2dly, This should teach us to * *beware of such false Reformers, who come to us in Sheeps cloathing, but inwardly are ravening Wolves, when we may so well know them by their Fruits.* To declare against Popery, and for a farther Reformation, when the design is wholly against the true Religion, is only the old Artifice of gilding the Pill, to make it go down the better. The Age it seems is not yet ripe, for Atheism to appear bare-fac'd; notwithstanding all its Efforts, there is still so much Authority left both in Church and State, as to hinder it pulling off the Mask; and this is the ground of the Atheists quarrel against all Authority; which therefore must be represented, as *Popish, Absurd, and Blasphemous*, in order to overthrow it the more effectually; for then despoiling the Church of her lawful Power, and the Prince of his just Prerogative, is *rendering a noble Service to the one, wiping off the Scandal of an Authority, that would bring back all the Absurdities of Popery*; and making the other a glorious Prince, such as the Ancestors of these Gentlemen did at last make King Charles the Martyr. To imagine that these Pretenders to Reformation are in good earnest, is to expect to gather Grapes of Thorns,

* Mat. 7. 15, 16.

or *Figs of Thistles*: And therefore it is a wonder that any sober Man, that has a concern for Religion in general, how much an Enemy soever he be to our Church, should yet give such an *elogium*, as a late Author¹ does, to our *Libeller*, who whatever party in Religion he personates, does that only in order to subvert the whole. But I shall leave that Author to answer to the Learned Person², who has already call'd him to account for the Character he bestows upon this Licentious Writer, and for the *grave cheat* he combines with him to charge upon our Clergy; and shall only observe, that it was so scandalous in a late Reign for a Party, who are always declaiming against the Popery of the Church of *England*, to take part against her, even with the Papists themselves, that one would have hoped they should not have added to that scandal in this, and join'd against her now with the very Atheists; and that unhappily in an accusation of *Forgery*, which is wholly their own, as well in this new instance of it, which Mr. Robinson pretends to have discover'd, as in that alledg'd by the Author of *Priest-Craft in Perfection*: For as it has been shewn, that the contested Clause of the 20th Article was not foisted in by the Church of *England* Clergy, but ras'd and expung'd by the Faction: So those Contents of the 149 Psalm, which express a *Power in the Church*

Another Forgery charged on the Clergy by a late Author is also purely their own.

¹ Robinson's *Review of the Case of Liturgy*, &c. Pref. p. 13. ² *Laycraft Exemplify'd*.

over the *Consciences of Men*, appearing to be coeval with that Translation of the Bible appointed to be read in Churches, and to have been printed in all the Editions of it, till in the late Rebellion it was thought fit to change that mystical Interpretation of the Psalm (which yet is justify'd^a by the Assembly of Divines) into a literal one, and to leave the *Consciences of Men* out of these Contents, and stile this a power over *Men of the World*, and by such other Expressions, as might transfer the Power from the *Consciences* to the *Persons* of Men, and justify those Rebels, who in a literal Sense were for binding^b their Kings with Chains, and their Nobles with Fetters of Iron: All this appearing evidently from above twenty several Editions that I have consulted, which all in the Contents of this Psalm, express the Church's Power to rule the *Consciences of Men*, and extend from the Year 1612 to the Year 1648 inclusively, that is from the first Impression of this new Translation of the Bible, which was finish'd^c in the Year 1611, and first printed in

^a *Assemb. Annot. in loc.* ^b *Psalm. 149. 8.* ^c *Full. Ch. Hist. L. 10. p. 57.* Jacobi Le Long Bibliothecæ sacræ pars altera, cap. 10. p. 330, 331. Biblia ex Hebræo & Græco in Anglicum conversa Sermonem jussu & auspiciis Jacobi primi Magnæ Britanniæ Regis in Fol. in 12° Londini 1612. Hæc Editio absoluta est A°. 1612. Juxta Johannem Durellum.

Hanc Versionem adornare cæperunt ab A°. 1604 numero 47 viri ad hoc deputati, & variis Classibus distributi, & absolverunt saltem qui superstites fuerunt A°. 1611. typisq; mandarunt 1612. Vide Acta &c. Synod. Dordrac. Sess. 7.

1621. and that with new^d Contents to the Chapters, in which the above-mention'd change being found in no Edition that I have yet met with, till 1654, and 1657, and the former Contents generally restor'd since the Year 1661; from all this we may conclude against our Author's *Second* in this Accusation of Forgery, and almost in his own words, that his Account of the Church's Power is far from being really the sense of the Church of England, and does only speak what an ambitious restless Faction would fain have to be her sense: And that these are the Men who have therefore impudently presum'd to raise an Assertion of her just Power out of the Articles of her Religion, nay even out of various Editions of her very Bible, and in the room of it foist into the latter the most impious Doctrine of deposing and murdering God's anointed: This may suffice at present, to have trac'd this pretension to its Original, and shewn how and by whom it first crept into the Bible, which was so greatly to be wish'd; and I may add, for what end, viz. to possess themselves of a power not only over the Consciences but Persons of their Fellow Subjects, which they are always grasping at, and by the basest Acts and boldest Forgeries (such as these two which this Author so appositely joins together, and that of changing *we* into *ye* in Act. 6. 3. and foisting the word (*in*) into

^d Biblioth. Sacr. p. 332. The 7th Direction to the Translators there mention'd is, ut nova argumenta singulis libris, & novæ periochæ singulis capitibus præfigerentur.

A Vindication of the

1 Cor. 12, 28. between *helps* and *governments*, and such like) had once not only almost, but altogether got into *their hands*: and if this inquiry have not been pursued with that *leisure*, and *care*, that might have been expected from the *band* judg'd so proper for this work, (that of the *ingenious Gentleman*, who happily discover'd the *grave cheat* with respect to the *Clause* in the 20th *Article*, and expos'd it, as it deserves) yet I am confident it has been made with more truth and fidelity; and if I have not leisure to expose it, as it deserves, 'tis well for the Author I was in so much haste. And now to return to his *ingenious Gentleman*.

3dly, I cannot after all this but conclude, that his *most excellent and pure Church*, from which he has taken so much pains to wipe off the scandal of this *Popish Clause*; as (to shew his great reach in *Politicks*) he assur'd us some Months since, that our *Legislature* were clearing her from maintaining the most absurd and blasphemous *Doctrine of Passive-Obedience*: I cannot but conclude, that that Church and the Church of *England* are not the same; and that as by the *true Religion* he means^d that natural Religion, which occurs to every body, and which without the help of *Priests* or *Magistrates*, all well-meaning Men must be suppos'd to come into, without a high Reflection on *Almighty God*; a Religion that seems to exclude all *Revelation*: So by the Church he does not mean ours, as

it now stands reform'd from the Corruptions of the Church of Rome, and represented in the 39 Articles, tho' this contested Clause were happily omitted: But a Church much better establish'd upon the Chymical Notions of a few *Enthusiasts*, whose *Rights* are to be found in the incomparable Works of Dr. Tindal, Mr. Whiston, Mr. Lock, Mr. Le Clerc, Mr. Bayle, and to name no more, in his own. A Church *the best constituted in the World*, without any need of either Priests or Magistrates, without Power or Authority, unless that of the Subjects to resist and depose their Sovereign; whereas ours unhappily in her Articles and Canons, in her Liturgy and Homilies, in her Acts of Uniformity, and in her very Bible does *maintain the Doctrine of Passive-Obedience, absurd and blasphemous* as it is; and whatever may be done with our Author's Church, this Doctrine seems to have taken such root in ours, that it will not be so easie as he imagins, *to clear her of it*: And who told him, that our Legislature have any such design? I confess I am no great Politician; but it seems a little strange to me, that half a dozen Gentlemen amidst the Smoke and Dirt of C——n's Coffee-House, should be able to discover what Resolutions the Queen, Lords, and Commons of Great-Britain will take in Matters of so great Importance to every Man's private Conscience, and to the publick Interest of the United Kingdom.

47bly, As our Author would infer^e his pretended discoveries to be very advantageous to true Religion: So I may with much more justice infer the truth and excellency of the Religion of the Church of England from the frequent attacks made upon it, more than on any other, in this Age of Atheism and Infidelity, by such as our Author, who are manifestly Enemies to all Religion, and as such always choose to make their assault, where they think it likely to do most prejudice to Religion in general. For tho' all the Religions in the World, at least all that are Christian, do agree in several Fundamental points, which these Gentlemen are pleas'd to call in question, as the Being of a God, a future Judgment, the Truth of the Scriptures, and the like; and therefore any of them might be attack'd upon these points, as well as ours, and indeed are one and all most nearly concern'd in every such assault made upon any of them; yet these Assailants are too great Politicians, to make War against a Confederacy; and therefore level their Artillery against one party of Religion, and that reduc'd by their insidious distinctions of *High and Low-Church* into as narrow a compass as they can, when their design is evidently against the whole: But then they single out that Party, in whose overthrow, if they could once again happily effect it, they have reason to think Religion in general would receive the greatest blow: And tho' to

^e Pr. Cr. p. 47.

their great grief this is the strongest party; (I am sure it is so with respect to their Arguments, whatever it be as to their number) it is some help to these Gentlemen in this regard, that instead of drawing upon themselves all the other Parties in Religion, by making their attack upon this, they need only personate one of those Sects to prevail with the whole Body of Dissenters to abandon their common Christianity (as was just now observ'd of one of their Leaders) and join with these it's avow'd Enemies, to pull down the Church of *England*, by which whatever these Accessaries mean, those Principals intend nothing less, than the whole Church of God. To engage a Religion that has so many Errors and Corruptions in it, as that either of the Church of *Rome*, or of any Congregation of our Dissenting Brethren, tho' the attack were chiefly carried on against the soundest parts of it, and with never so much Success, yet would have so much the Air of only charging her Errors and Corruptions, that Religion it self would not suffer much by it: But the Church of *England* having reform'd from all the Errors of Popery; and that with so much Judgment and Moderation, as not to run with any of the Sectaries into another extreme, the only quarrel which they have, and which our Author would be thought to have against her, whatever attempts are made upon her; as she is thus the purest and soundest part of the Reformation, must

be design'd to wound Religion in her very Vitals, when made by such as are known Enemies to all Religion: And as these Libertines could not give a greater demonstration of their Enmity to Religion in general, than by directing their utmost Efforts against the purest part of it, at the same time that they give such clear intimations, that their malice does not stop there: So they could not give us a better proof of the good Opinion they have of our Church, than to single her out from amongst all the Religions in the World, to vend the spight and ill-will against her, which by so many insinuations they plainly discover to be intended against the whole Church of Christ, and all Religion in general. And I could not better conclude this Vindication of the Church of England against the Author of *Priest-Craft in Perfection*, than by observing from this very attempt of his against her, that she seems to be even in his opinion the best Religion in the World, and the strongest Bulwark against Atheism.



FINIS.

